



*Ex Libris*  
C. K. OGDEN

D



THE LIBRARY  
OF  
THE UNIVERSITY  
OF CALIFORNIA  
LOS ANGELES











Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation







PITT  
HIS LIFE AND TIMES







J. Chapman, sculp.

Walker & Bowell, publ.

Lincerely yours  
W. H.

PITT : some Chapters of  
his Life and Times.' By  
the Right Hon. Edward Gibbon,  
Lord Ashburnham.

WITH PORTRAIT

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

COPY OF INSCRIPTION ON BACK OF PICTURE

'This original picture, painted from the life by JOHN HOPPNER, is a most accurate and impressive likeness of that unequalled statesman and entirely faultless man, Wm. Pitt. This Portrait was finished on the 28th Oct. A.D. 1805. He died 1806, Jany 23.'—MULGRAVE.



Family  
Photo

COPY OF INKSCRIPTION ON BACK OF PHOTOGRAPH

This original picture printing from the film of your Photo  
was made by Bell & Howell Co. It is an absolute  
copy because of the high quality of the original  
negative. This picture was taken in New York City  
at the Hotel Plaza Hotel, 53rd Street, New York, N.Y.

PITT : some Chapters of  
his Life and Times. By  
the Right Hon. Edward Gibson,  
Lord Ashbourne

*WITH PORTRAITS*

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.  
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON  
NEW YORK AND BOMBAY  
1898



DA  
522  
P6A81

## P R E F A C E

---

THESE few chapters, written and put together in the midst of other pursuits, may help to show what manner of man Pitt was. He has been dead nearly a century, and a large number of his letters have been from time to time discovered, and probably all parts of his life are now well known. It is worthy of note that none of his letters and no incident in his life disclose anything to his discredit, or tend to lower the high estimate of his objects. As in the case of all public men, there may be different criticisms as to the policy he from time to time pursued, and as to the wisdom and expediency of parts of his public conduct; but no ground has been discovered to justify doubt as to the rectitude of his motives or the elevation of his character.

My purpose in this book is limited—not to write a continuous biography, but to confine myself to some chapters on Pitt's life and times. Those who desire to study his life as a whole can do so in Lord Stanhope's interesting pages; or, if they wish to get an attractive

condensed narrative, they can well do so in Lord Rosebery's 'Pitt.' All, however, anxious to master the history of Pitt's life and times, during the period with which he deals, must study Mr. Lecky's standard work.

I have been very fortunate in finding abundant new materials—many unpublished letters of Pitt, his mother, and brother, and also of George III., Canning, Lord Clare, Lord Fitzwilliam, the Duke of Rutland, the Duke of Portland, Orde, Dundas, Bishop Tomline, Georgiana Duchess of Devonshire, Lord Auckland, and others.

The late Lord Bolton (who was the grandson of the Right Honourable Thomas Orde, Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant in the time of the fourth Duke of Rutland) kindly placed at my disposal the Bolton Papers. I there found many most interesting unpublished letters of Pitt, of the Duke of Rutland, and Orde, together with much valuable information. The present Duke of Rutland added to my store, lent me the journal of his grandfather's tour in Ireland, and gave me copies of Cosway's miniatures of his grandmother, the beautiful Duchess of Rutland.

The late Lord Waterford also supplied me with useful information about the Right Honourable John Beresford, together with his likeness.

In the British Museum, amongst the Pelham Papers, and to a less degree amongst the Auckland Papers, I found many documents and letters of much interest and

importance, of which I have made much use in the chapters on Lord Fitzwilliam and Lord Clare.

I also had the great advantage, during two visits, of looking through the large and important collection of Pitt Papers at Orwell Park, the home of Mr. Ernest G. Pretyman, M.P., and Lady Beatrice Pretyman. Mr. Pretyman is the great-grandson of Bishop Tomline, and is in possession of a great number of letters and papers—some original and some copies—extending over the whole range of Pitt's life. There are (in addition to some papers not so collected) a large number of boxes full of letters and papers, many of them of considerable interest and much value, and many as yet unpublished. My purpose being limited, I mainly confined my examination to the parts which specially concerned me. Amidst such an attractive mass of materials I was often tempted to wander, but I deemed it necessary to adhere to the scope of my plan, as I had not time or opportunity to embark on more ambitious lines. I trust, however, that some day the public will be afforded the advantage of reading in a properly edited form the varied correspondence preserved at Orwell Park. The letters I have utilised in my chapters are of deep interest, and will, I venture to hope, add to the public information on the matters with which I deal. Many of Pitt's books also are in the possession of Mr. Pretyman, and an engraving of his book-plate will be found on the cover of this volume.

My lamented friend, Mr. Edward Stanhope, had gone through the Pitt Papers at Orwell Park and arranged them. One of the boxes, marked ‘Pitt Family Papers,’ I found empty, but with a memorandum, in his handwriting, saying that he had removed the contents to his residence for examination. This led to my subsequently paying a visit to Revesby Abbey. Mrs. Stanhope did not think she had the papers, but she most kindly made a search, and they were found and restored to Orwell Park after I had made copies of such as were suited to my chapters. Revesby Abbey teems with memorials of Pitt. Mr. Stanhope regarded the subject as one of the great interests of his life, but there was no trace of any design on his part to write any book. He had, however, made (as his *magnum opus*) a marvellous and priceless collection of pictures and caricatures of Pitt—interpaged at suitable places in his father’s Life of Pitt. He had, besides, numerous volumes of illustrations and caricatures (including Gillray’s) of the time, together with a lock of Pitt’s hair. The whole place was full of signs and tokens of Pitt—all preserved by the widow of Edward Stanhope with pious and reverent care. With her kind permission I have printed in the Appendix an abridgment of the catalogue of all known portraits and engravings of Pitt, made in 1886 by the late Mr. Scharf.

The present Lord Stanhope, in the kindest way, placed at my disposal the original series (75) of letters

from Lady Chatham to Pitt's first tutor, Mr. Wilson, ranging from 1765 to 1798, several of which, full of interest, I have used. I am also indebted to the present Lord Auckland for a copy of the miniature of the Honourable Eleanor Eden, which is prefixed to the chapter on 'Pitt's one Love Story.' He has also in his possession a most attractive portrait of her in later life as Countess of Buckinghamshire, and one can readily trace in the handsome face of the dignified elderly lady the features of the young girl of twenty who won Pitt's heart.

I have also to thank the Duchess of Cleveland for a copy of her '*Life and Letters of Lady Hester Stanhope*', printed for private circulation, which gives a vivid account of Pitt's favourite niece, who did so much to brighten his closing years. I have availed myself of some of the interesting information it contains. My thanks are also due to the Duchess of Wellington for permission to reproduce the portrait of Pitt by Gainsborough Dupont at Apsley House.

I desire also to express my gratitude to Mr. W. A. Burdett-Coutts, M.P., for his permission to produce an engraving from his splendid picture of Pitt by Hoppner, which contains the following inscription:—'This original picture, painted from the life by John Hoppner, is a most accurate and impressive likeness of that unequalled statesman and entirely faultless man, William Pitt. This portrait was finished on the

28th October, A.D. 1805. He died 1806, January 23rd.—Mulgrave.'

I am indebted to the National Portrait Gallery of Ireland for the portraits of Clare, Grattan, and Fitz-William; whilst I owe to the National Portrait Gallery of England the portrait of Pitt's father, painted whilst he was still 'the Great Commoner.'

During a recent visit to Cambridge the Master of Pembroke (the Rev. Dr. Searle) most kindly gave me all the College information about Pitt's residence and showed me the note of his admission, and also his rooms in Ivy Court.

I have, from all these sources, been able to collect information and correspondence which will, I hope, be of interest.

# CONTENTS

---

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. PITT'S EARLY LIFE . . . . .	1
II. THE DUKE OF RUTLAND . . . . .	42
III. ORDE. . . . .	77
IV. PITT'S CORRESPONDENCE ON THE COMMERCIAL RESO- LUTIONS . . . . .	116
V. PITT'S MOTHER AND ELDEST BROTHER . . . . .	149
VI. LORD FITZWILLIAM . . . . .	180
VII. PITT'S ONE LOVE STORY . . . . .	230
VIII. LORD CLARE . . . . .	249
IX. THE UNION . . . . .	280
X. PITT AFTER 1800 . . . . .	302
XI. BISHOP TOMLINE AND PITT—LAST DAYS. . . . .	333
APPENDIX . . . . .	369
INDEX . . . . .	393

*Explanation of Abbreviated References.*

*Bolton MSS.*, the papers in possession of Lord Bolton, at Bolton Hall, Yorkshire.

*Pretyman MSS.*, the papers in possession of Mr. Ernest Pretyman, M.P., at Orwell Park, Ipswich.

*Rutland Correspondence*, the correspondence of the fourth Duke, edited by the present Duke of Rutland.

*The Stanhope Papers*, the papers in possession of the present Lord Stanhope.

*Hist. MSS. Com.*, the Historical Manuscripts Commission, Duke of Rutland's papers and Lord Carlisle's papers.

*The Pelham Papers*, the several volumes of Pelham MSS. at the British Museum.

*The Auckland Papers*, the several volumes of Auckland MSS. at the British Museum.

*The Westmoreland Papers*, the papers in the State Paper Office, Dublin Castle, and Dublin Record Office.

## LIST OF PLATES

---

W. PITT . . . . .	<i>Frontispiece</i>
<i>Engraved from portrait painted by HOPPNER, October 1805, for LORD MULGRAVE (see inscription in Preface), now the property of W. A. BURDETT-COUTTS, Esq., M.P.</i>	
THE DUCHESS OF RUTLAND, WIFE OF THE FOURTH DUKE . . . . .	To face p. 42
<i>From a miniature by COSWAY, at Belvoir Castle, the pro- perty of the DUKE OF RUTLAND.</i>	
THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THOMAS ORDE (LORD BOLTON) . . . . .	77
<i>From a portrait by G. ROMNEY, the property of LORD BOLTON.</i>	
THE RIGHT HONOURABLE JOHN BERESFORD, M.P. . . . .	116
<i>From a portrait at Curraghmore, the property of the MARQUIS OF WATERFORD.</i>	
'THE GREAT COMMONER,' PITT'S FATHER, LORD CHATHAM . . . . .	149
<i>From a portrait in the National Portrait Gallery of Eng- land by W. HOARE.</i>	
EARL FITZWILLIAM . . . . .	180
<i>From mezzotint portrait by GROZER, after SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS, in Irish National Portrait Gallery.</i>	
THE HONOURABLE ELEANOR EDEN, DAUGHTER OF THE FIRST LORD AUCKLAND, AND AFTER- WARDS THE COUNTESS OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE . . . . .	230
<i>From a miniature in the possession of the present LORD AUCKLAND.</i>	

THE EARL OF CLARE . . . . .	To face p. 249
<i>From a portrait by H. D. HAMILTON in the Irish National Portrait Gallery, purchased at the Mount Shannon sale in 1888.</i>	
THE RIGHT HONOURABLE HENRY GRATTAN . . . . .	280
<i>From mezzotint by HODGES, in Irish National Portrait Gallery, from portrait by C. G. STUART.</i>	
LORD CASTLEREAGH . . . . .	302
<i>From mezzotint by TURNER, in Irish National Portrait Gallery, from portrait by SIR THOMAS LAWRENCE in Londonderry House, with replica at Windsor Castle.</i>	
THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM PITT, AET. 30 . . . . .	332
<i>From portrait by GAINSBOROUGH DUPONT, by permission of the DUCHESS OF WELLINGTON.</i>	

As this Book is in great demand,  
it is respectfully requested that it may  
be returned to the Library as soon as  
read.

*Errata*

Page 223, line 13, *after* Windham *insert* as well as Pitt  
,, 290, „ 25, „ evidence *insert* apart from patronage  
,, 329, „ 1, „ Spencer *insert* Portland



# P I T T

## SOME CHAPTERS OF HIS LIFE AND TIMES

---

### CHAPTER I

#### PITT'S EARLY LIFE

William Pitt's birth—Early delicacy—His father—Mr. Wilson, his first tutor—Lady Chatham's letters to Mr. Wilson, 1765–1775—First reference to William in the letters—His taste always for public life—Saying when his father made a peer—Chatham's training of William—His affection for him—William learned with ease—Tastes—Private theatricals—Tragedy of ‘Laurentius’—Dumaresque's account of it—His lines on ‘Coombe Wood’—Admitted to Pembroke Hall—Dr. Petyman—‘Chatham Correspondence’—His mother's letter—Illness at Cambridge—Letters of his mother to Mr. Wilson—To William at Cambridge—From him to his mother—His first letters to Petyman—His rooms at Cambridge—Takes his degree—Continues to reside there—His friends there—Visits to London—To House of Lords—Death of Chatham—William's letter to Petyman—His sister Harriot's reference to him—His power of putting trouble aside—Lord Liverpool's opinion on the subject—Wilberforce's—Slender fortune—Called to Bar—Western Circuit—Practice and chance of success—Stood for Cambridge University—Defeat—Returned for Appleby—First speech—Estimates of Lord North, Fox, Burke, and Selwyn—Refuses any ‘subordinate’ office—Thus separated from Fox—Shelburne succeeds Rockingham—Pitt Chancellor of the Exchequer—Coalition Ministry—Defeat—Action of George III.—Pitt Prime Minister—Mrs. Crewe's description of his Ministry—He bides his time—Dundas—Lord Temple—Curiosity of country—Soon showed his powers—Judgments of Windham, Brougham, and Canning—Refuses rich sinecure—Gibbon's tribute—Duke of Argyll's—Majority in new Parliament.

WILLIAM PITT was born at Hayes, ‘in the best bedroom, probably the same in which his father died,’ on May 28,

1759, ‘the year which was, perhaps, the most glorious and eventful in his father’s life.’<sup>1</sup>

He was very delicate and very precocious, dear to both parents, but the idol of his father, ‘the great Commoner.’ Every care was taken with his education—the father, however, being the chief guide and director, although the Rev. Edward Wilson was a capable and honest tutor.

Of his early life we have now a fair record, and Lord Stanhope, in his most excellent Life, has told some of the stories which survive, and given all the information that was then available. Lady Chatham’s<sup>2</sup> letters to Mr. Wilson, his first tutor, have since come to the possession of the present Lord Stanhope, and give much additional information. His connection with the family began when William Pitt was only six, and the correspondence opens with the following short letter, showing that the then dinner-hour of the great Commoner was three!

Hayes : Wednesday night, 1765.

Mr. Pitt and Lady Chatham send their compliments to Mr. Wilson, and will be very glad to have the pleasure of seeing him to-morrow (being Thursday) at dinner if it is convenient to him.

They dine at three o’clock.

Thus commenced a lifelong friendship between Lady Chatham and this excellent clergyman, and the following letter shows how she and their father looked to him for information about all the children :

<sup>1</sup> Lord Stanhope’s *Life of Pitt*, i. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Lady Chatham was the sister of Lord Temple and G. Grenville. Her spelling is throughout preserved.

North End : Tuesday, July 29, 1766.

Sir,—Mr. Pitt and I were greatly pleased with the accounts which your letter brought us yesterday, and figure to ourselves the delight the young folks must have received from the unexpected incident of the American Chiefs, and the surprise of honest little John at being so extraordinarily addrest.

We both admire and applaud him very much for his not chusing to risk the original of so peculiar a performance. It seems like something dropt from the clouds for their entertainment, for an odder event I think cou'd not well happen.

Our satisfaction is very great in finding that the ardour to excell prevails so happily amongst your pupils. Pray let them know how much it rejoices papa and mama to have constantly such sweet accounts of their behaviour, which they may trust will not be forgotten, but that they shall endeavour to please them in return. If they persevere, I shall have no more doubts about pretty Harriot now, for I am persuaded she must find it mighty agreeable to be so much commended.

Many tender loves and blessings from papa and mama to all the dear tribe. I believe it wou'd be best to decline going upon the water, the weather and altogether considered, so if you please to make the excuse with many thanks. Anything worth seeing that offers within reach of a ride, or of the coach, if you and Mr. Sparry find no particular objections either of fatigue, or breaking in too much upon business, you will go your little party to see it. You will make our compliments to Mr. Payne, with our acknowledgements for the trouble he gives himself. I have no time for anything further at present than to make Mr. Pitt's compliments to you, and repeat the pleasures your account of the dear children gave us.

Your faithful, humble servant,

CHATHAM.<sup>1</sup>

The next letter contains the first clear reference to William :

<sup>1</sup> Lady Chatham so signed her name after her own and before her husband's elevation to the peerage. She was made Baroness Chatham on December 4, 1761, and he was created Earl of Chatham in July 1766.

Howe : August 15, 1769.

Sir,—The letter which I had the pleasure to receive from you by Sunday's post gave a most sincere satisfaction to my Lord and me ; and we desire you to be assured how truly we rejoice in the dignity conferred upon you. We know how well you merit the distinction shewn to you, and are happy in its being acknowledged in a manner which is so agreeable to you. . . .

We returned hither from Wotton, Sunday, where we had enjoyed all together the sincere and real comforts and pleasures which flow from family union and concord. We are much obliged to you for participating so kindly in the happiness which it has diffused amongst us. We propose setting out from here Thursday morning, and mean to breakfast at Hayes the Saturday morning following. Pray give papa's and mama's tenderest love to William. I will reserve to the time of seeing him the pleasure of telling him what a sweet correspondent I think him, and how diverting I found his last letter. I know he will readily excuse mama, as the difference in time will be so small, and that the delay will be more than made up to him by our happy meeting. Be so good as to remember me to Mrs. Sparry, and inform her of our intended motion, which I believe I may trust she will not be sorry to hear of.

I am, sir, your most faithful, humble servant,

HESTER CHATHAM.

William's mind and tastes readily went in the direction of public life, and when in 1766 his father was made a peer, he said, 'I am glad I am not the eldest son ; I want to speak in the House of Commons like papa.' Lord Chatham applied himself to train him for public speaking, to read well, to be careful in elocution, to translate—always using and sometimes pausing for the right word—and to cultivate the power of rapid and appropriate arrangement of thoughts and topics. He made him constantly recite from Shakespeare and

Milton. He directed him to study the style and language of Barrow and Bolingbroke, and must often from his own experience have given this son, with the strangely mature mind, a thousand hints to reach oratorical excellence, which he heeded not only as the words of a loving father, but as the precepts of a great master.

Chatham was deeply impressed by his son. When the boy was only fourteen, in writing to Lady Chatham, he referred to William as the ‘Philosopher’ and the ‘Counsellor,’ and in writing to his son he used terms showing his great love : ‘The hope and comfort of my life ;’ ‘sweet boy ;’ ‘my loved William ;’ ‘my noble, amiable boy.’<sup>1</sup>

William Pitt learned with ease and rapidity, and at an exceptionally early age had acquired a wide knowledge of books and a considerable education. It is not recorded that he had any great liking for games or sports. He rode, however, at Cambridge, and Lord Wellesley says ‘he was very fond of exercise on horseback, and when in the country frequently joined the hounds of his neighbourhood,’ and he may have done so as a boy. He took out game licences for himself when Prime Minister,<sup>2</sup> and liked partridge shooting, and it is possible he began it in his youth. He was fond of the country, and took an interest in farming, and at Holwood looked personally after his trees and gardens. Addington (afterwards the Speaker and his successor) saw William as a boy taking part in private theatricals ;

<sup>1</sup> *Chatham Correspondence*, iv. *pas.*

<sup>2</sup> A licence for 1799 is in the *Revesby MSS.*

but even his father was not impressed, and said he was ‘an awkward youth, who acquitted himself with remarkable stiffness.’ Too much of that stiffness, in public, at all events, marked his whole life.

Lord Stanhope mentions that young Pitt wrote a tragedy, ‘Laurentius,’ which was acted in 1772; but from a paper<sup>1</sup> of Dr. Dumaresque (who was ‘indulged with the liberty of reading it after he had seen it acted’), addressed to Lord Ailesbury, it would appear that it was the joint work of the Pitt children, or at all events the three elder—Lord Pitt, Lady Hester, and William, the latter, no doubt, the largest contributor.

The paper is described as an ‘imperfect and superficial account of a play written and acted by very young persons in their immature years. . . . The play was written wholly by the five children of the late Earl of Chatham, viz. John Lord Pitt, William Pitt, and Lady Hester Pitt, with the two youngest, Lady Hariot and John. They held regular meetings for their joint consultations, and contrived it so that they and they only should have their several parts to act. . . . Lady Hester was the Queen, and Mr. William Pitt the faithful Minister. . . . It may be presumed that the greater share of praise may be adjudged to William. . . . The late Mr. James Grenville, uncle to the authors, told me he wondered how such young folks could be so exact in observing the unities.’

The play was political; and William Pitt was never anything but a politician.<sup>2</sup> He was the son of a poli-

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*

<sup>2</sup> In the *National Review* for May 1892 are some verses on ‘Coombe

tician, and he was reared as a politician. The ambition he set before himself, and that was steadily set before him, was to follow his father's footsteps into and in the House of Commons.

He entered Cambridge University before he was fourteen, and was admitted to Pembroke Hall<sup>1</sup> on April 26, 1773. The following extract from a letter of Mr. Wilson to his wife, dated December 2, 1772, is interesting :

I could not have acted with more prudence than I have done in the affaire of Pembroke Hall. Mr. Pitt is not the child his years bespeak him to be. He has now all the understanding of a man, and is, and will be, my steady friend thro' life.

Wood,' with the following note : 'The MS. from which these lines are printed has been sent to us by a granddaughter of the first Earl of Harrowby, to whom Pitt presented the original. It is believed that they and the juvenile tragedy mentioned in Lord Stanhope's Life were Pitt's only essays in verse.' There are fifteen stanzas, and the two following contain the only references to love and 'Platonic dreams' :

- ‘ 11. But soon informed with nobler powers,  
I sought thy awful gloom ;  
There frequent soothed my evening hours  
That best deceiver, Love.
- 13. Then patriot passions fired my breast  
With freedom's glowing themes,  
And Virtue's image rose confest  
In bright platonic dreams.’

<sup>1</sup> The entry in the admission book of Pembroke Hall is as follows : 'Honorabilis Gulielmus Pitt, nobilissimi D<sup>ni</sup> Comitis de Chatham Filius natu secundus natus apud —— 28 Maij, 1759, anno ætatis sue Decimo quarto nondum completo, admissus est ad mensam sociorum sub tutoribus May et Bell, magistris, Ap. 26, 1773.' According to the usage, the name would be entered six months before beginning residence. Turner had become a tutor in June 1773; and somewhat later Pretzman also became a tutor. Dr. Searle, the honoured Master of Pembroke Hall, showed me Lord Chatham's original letter of October 3, 1773, introducing his son to the senior tutor (Mr. Turner), and also the original draft, with many alterations and amendments, of Lord Wellesley's well-known letter of November 22, 1836. This interesting draft was presented to the College by the Duke of Devonshire.

He has sound principles, a grateful and liberal heart, and *talents unequal'd*. He will go to Pembroke, not a weak boy to be made a property of, but to be admir'd as a prodigy; not to hear lectures, but to spread light. His parts are most astonishing and universal. He will be fully qualified for a wrangler *before he goes*, and be an accomplish'd classick, mathematician, historian, and poet. This is no exaggeration, believe me, but as it will one day shew itself fully.

His life at the University is fairly known, and is to some extent recorded by Lord Stanhope and Bishop Tomline. The acquaintance of the latter, then Dr. Pretyman, a distinguished tutor of the University, was at once made by Pitt, and a close and warm friendship began, which lasted unbroken through life. He learned much under the wise guidance of Pretyman and another eminent tutor of the college, Mr. Turner. His career at Cambridge was marked by extraordinary propriety and regularity of conduct. His health necessitated great care and quiet, but his keen and active brain ever kept him working.

The ‘Chatham Correspondence’<sup>1</sup> contains several letters of William Pitt to his father and mother, and from them to him, during his University life. They show how he passed his time, how steadily he watched public affairs, and what a close and affectionate interest he took in his father’s life and speeches. The following letter and its postscript show how the parents addressed their young son at that period of his life, and is full of interest :

Burton Pynsent<sup>2</sup>: Oct. 9, 1773.

Thursday’s post brought us no letter from the dear traveller. We trust this day will prove more satisfactory. It is the happy

<sup>1</sup> *Chatham Correspondence*, iv.

<sup>2</sup> *Pretyman MSS.*

day that gave us your brother, and will not be less in favour with *all* here if it should give us about four o'clock an epistle from my dear William. By that time I reckon we shall be warm in our cups, and shall not fail to pour forth with renewed joy grateful libations over the much-wished tidings of your prosperous progress towards your destination. We compute that yesterday brought you to the venerable aspect of Alma Mater, and that you are invested to-day with the Toga virilis. Your race of *manly* virtue and useful knowledge is now begun, and may the favour of Heaven smile upon the noble career.

Little Beckford was really disappointed at not being in time to see you : a good mark for my young *vivid* friend. He is just as much compounded of the elements of *air* and *fire*, or he was. A due proportion of *terrestrial* solidity will, I trust, come, to make him perfect. How happy, my loved boy, is it that your mama and I can tell ourselves there is at Cambridge *one* without a beard, '*and all the elements so mix'd in him,*' that nature might stand up and say, *This is a man.*

I now take leave for to-day, not meaning this for what you call a *regular* letter, but a flying thought that wings itself towards my absent William. Honors are ready, and all is *birthday*. Bradshaw has shone this auspicious morning in a very fine speech of congratulation, but I foresee his sun sets weeping in the fatal West—that is, a fatal bowl of punch will before night quench this Luminary of Oratory.

Adieu, again and again, sweet boy, and if you acquire health and strength every time I wish them to you, you will be a second Samson, and, what is more, will, I am sure, keep your hair. Every good wish attends your kind fellow-traveller and chumm, nor will he be forgot in our flowing bowls to-day.

The following in Lady Chatham's handwriting is added :

If more could be said expressive of feeling, my dearest dear boy, I would add a letter to this epistle ; but, as it is composed, I will only sign to its expressive contents,

Your fond and loving mother,

HESTER CHATHAM.

Shortly after the receipt of this letter he became seriously unwell at Cambridge, and the following letters<sup>1</sup> from Lady Chatham to Mr. Wilson show the deep anxiety of his parents, how keenly they noted and how much they appreciated the affectionate care he received all through his illness, and their joy when he was able to return to their own home :

Burton Pynsent : Oct. 29, 1773.

How slow we thought Thursday in arriving you, my dear sir, who so well know what our feelings must have been in the interval of anxious expectation, will easily figure to yourself. We are very thankful to the gracious God for the comfort your welcome and kind letter brought us, which answered all we could reasonably hope in the time. The material point being right, of the nights being good since the attack, etc., we indulge the pleasure of thinking that, treated as he is, with such attentive care, he will be enabled, without risk, to make out his stay for the intended term, which, if it may be, is most desirable, as the reverse would be, to the sensibility of his mind, a sad mortification. There is nothing, *except our fears*, that we have felt more than the disappointment it will have been to him to find himself checked in the pleasing and prosperous career he was in. However, we flatter ourselves that the lively and agreeable society which he partakes of in the company of yourself, with the addition of Dr. Glynn (his new agreeable medical friend and admirer), will dissipate considerably the gentleman's quick reflections on that subject, and prevent too deep an impression beeing made by them. But in this even, as in everything else that concerns him, till the *frame* is more equal to the mind which lodges in it, *moderation in all points*, whether of business, idleness, or amusement, must be his governing maxim. With this rule he will know as much as the wise, have as much rest as he can support without being tired of it, and be as well diverted as those who study nothing else. . . . If you think we feel our distance from Pembroke Hall you will,

<sup>1</sup> Lord Stanhope's papers.

indeed, think very right. Suspence, where so dear an interest is concerned, is cruel ; and the loss of seeing our loved boy in a convalescent state most sensible. We are, notwithstanding, happy in the conviction that it is only the pain of suspense that would be avoided, and the joy of being present with the object of our fears and cares, that would be the gain ; for as to every advantage of attention and affectionate prudent management, if we were ten times present they could not be increased. God bless your care and endeavours, and may you be repaid by the perfect health of your dear patient, which I know would be more to your happiness than anything else I can wish for you in return for all your anxiety and trouble. The Academy desire to join in affectionate compliments to you. My Lord writes by the same post with this to our invalide to recomend the favourite system of moderation, and has done it in terms of cheerfulness which nobody knows how to do so well as himself, and which, whilst they will make William smile, will at the same time inforce the wisdom of pursuing the advice conveyed.

I am, my dear sir, ever most faithfully yours,

HESTER CHATHAM.

Burton Pynsent: Tuesday night, Nov. 2, 1773.

We have abundant thanks to render, my dear sir, to the gracious God for the comfort you have been enabled to give us upon the situation of our loved William. We do trust that we may indulge pleasing hopes that the worst is past, and that this sad mortification and cruel alarm will pay in the future (as we are given to hope) for the suffering and anxiety produced by them. Our sense of your prudent care and most affectionate attention on this trying occasion cannot be expressed equal to the degree of our feelings. Be assured that we entertain the strongest idea of it. Dr. Addington and Mrs. Sparry (not the most easily contented on this matter) both do ample justice to the whole of your proceeding. . . . Dr. Addington has been very full in his kind letter to us on the state of our dear invalide, and is very strong and direct against the idea of removing his and Dr. Glynn's patient to London, in which I mean to tell Mrs. Sparry we are perfectly agreed with him, and to desire her to

make herself easy with a determination which he thinks of the utmost importance. We trust in God that the advances, tho' slow, to recovery will reconcile her to this decision, will render the stay full of satisfaction to yourself. We must beg you to present our compliments to Dr. Glyn, and much more than compliments. My Lord and I are truly sensible of all the value of his most attentive care; and I must not omit that Dr. Addington has done ample justice to the skill, as well as to the very kind attention, of Dr. Glyn to his patient; and you have given us the additional pleasure of that in inclination, too, he is far from indifferent to his young acquaintance. . . . The first letter that I writ in answer to your first account of this mortifying illness you will have seen was writ with a view of it being shewed, had any anxiety from him made it necessary. The weakness since described made it, I imagine, a precaution that was of no consequence. . . .

I am, dear sir, with great truth,

Your obliged faithful friend and servant,

HESTER CHATHAM.

My Lord and the Home Accademy desire kind compliments. You will give the message which will best answer to what is judged right to our most loved boy.

Burton Pynsent : Nov. 6, 1773.

Thursday post, my dear sir, disappointed our impatient hope of receiving a further account of our loved William. No letter from any body at Pembroke Hall. Happily for some relief to our anxious suspense in consequence, a line in a letter of Mrs. —— to Hannah mention'd her having that afternoon heard from Cambridge the good news of Mr. Pitt's being better, and that Mrs. Sparry and her husband were all there. From this we derived comfort, and a sort of trust that matters were going on well, though not with so full a confidence as to make us feel quite easy under this circumstance. . . . The hearts of Burton Pynsent are with you all continually, and to the principal object of our tender care. We add also care for the zealous and affectionate friends that give such unwearied attention to all that good nursing calls for. We continue to support ourselves

with patience and calmness, but cannot be, as you may think, anything beyond that. I writ both to you and the excellent Pam by the conveyance of Thursday, and have, therefore, nothing any way material to say at present. May you have been able to send us by your latest account such intelligence as may give us cause for the expression of much happiness and joy, when I write by the next post. The weather is mild, and we hope it will so continue, without being attended with so much wet, till the dear Accademician may be sufficiently recruited to take the advantage of it for his return, which I shall leave him to judge what degree of pleasure it will bestow on those who delight so much in the society of their dearly loved William. Every wish for further comfort and satisfaction go alway with this letter to the little company of Pembroke.

Your faithful friend and affectionate servant,

HESTER CHATHAM.

Burton Pynsent : Wednesday, Nov. 17, 1773.

Dear Sir,—You will not wonder that our patience is but indifferently satisfied with accounts that seem, in our opinion, to keep at a great distance the prospect of our dear boy's return. I have no idea that there can be strength to justify a thought of removal till appetite is what it used to be, and that the stomach can bear solid food. The not having been out of bed when last you writ indicates what great caution must be used about exposing him to the air. And this throws us back in the hopes we had begun to entertain ; but though this is a disappointment to our eager wishes, yet we are thankful for the advances which have been made towards a more perfect recovery, and rejoice extremely in the history of the amusement of the day, which you may tell William are of the right *bel Air* sort, and much properer for a fashionable collegiate than the pouring upon dull books. It is a great satisfaction that the admirable Pam holds out well, if well without an epithet may be thought to signify quite well. All our wishes are carried on now to Tilley's return to-morrow from the post, when we do most exceedingly hope a more clear degree of comfort and pleasure will be conveyed to us by the letter we shall be to

receive from your obliging and kind attention to our anxious solicitude. . . .

Your faithful and affectionate friend,

HESTER CHATHAM.

Burton Pynsent: Nov. 22, 1773.

Your last letter, my dear sir, did not keep pace with the pleasing expectations which had been raised by your former of the post before. We had with great joy adopted the idea that amendment was begining to advance with quicker progress, and that the gain of strength in every four-and-twenty hours would be with an increased proportion. These flattering hopes received a cold damp by seeing that it had been thought necessary to eat the dinner in bed, and that the degree of weakness was such as to render the want of shoes no inconvenience. I must own that the circumstance affected me very much, as I don't know how to reckonile that part of dress being omitted, when he was to set up out of his bed, unless his poor feet have been blistered in the course of this sad illness. I seem now to myself to have lost sight of the near prospect that had been flatteringly offer'd to us of his setting out to return westward. My mind is continually turned to the dear object of your affectionate care, and many a painful reflexion occurs, as you will well believe. The misfortune of distance is most sensible, and makes one feel the wounding uncertainty that results from it. I pray Heaven that the account of this evening may be of the sort to quiet the present anxiety of my thoughts. Most happily, my Lord sees in a less distressing manner the situation described by you, and cleaves to the more cheering part of your letter, where you say all is going on as well as can be expected. For my part, when I put particulars together, I cannot find they make good so comfortable an assurance. We are struck extremely with the generous, disinterested behaviour of Doctor Glynn, and observe besides with what skill it is calculated to give spirits and confidence to his patient. I am sure you must be clear that we shall not omit at a proper time to make every sort of acknowledgement to Doctor Glyn. What a gift William has to conciliate the love of those who are once acquainted with

him ! I am persuaded that had he *no belongings* the doctor wou'd exert the same friendly zeal to him. What a delight if by-and-bye I shou'd find that all my melancholy ideas were mistimed, and that comfort and satisfaction have shone at Cambridge. May the Almighty grant that it may so prove ! Mr. Speke has breakfasted with us this morning, and is most impatient to hear of his dear worthy friend's having begun his travels in Italy—meaning Lyme. He desires most affectionate compliments. My Lord is much better, and the rest are going out in the coach. We have a beautiful day and a clear frost. I don't mend my pens, I believe you think, but I hope I am not quite unintelligible notwithstanding that, with haste added to it. Love in great abundance from all.

Your most sincere friend and  
affectionate, humble servant,

HESTER CHATHAM.

Burton Pynsent: Monday, 29, 1773.

You will not wonder, my dear sir, that our impatient wishes for the return of strength to your dear young friend shou'd expose us to feel dissapointment when accounts do not answer to them. Your kind letter to James, bringing us nothing positive of any ground gain'd since your last, and mentioning the continuance still of a great weakness, was somewhat mortifying to our hopes, and a fresh check to our pleasing expectations. Tho' don't imagine we flattered ourselves with the idea that you wou'd be able to set out as early as has been suggested to us you wou'd. We have always made allowances for the kind purpose of our friends in bringing nearer to our view than was exactly the case what wou'd give comfort and joy to us. My Lord and I both agree in thinking it quite right not to undertake such an enterprise as the journey hither till sufficient trial has been made whether there is strength enough to give success to the attempt. We therefore desire you will not be in a hurrey to remove, but stay to the longest time that Doctor Glyn and Doctor Addington shall judge necessary from the result of the effect of the airings, which, long before this can reach your hands, we trust will have been tried. We don't

imagine that the plan intended is that William shou'd make any long halt in Bond Street. At least, so Doctor Addington has given us to understand, and, with him, we think that there are a thousand objections to it. However, we are passive, and if it shou'd from any change be thought right, or that it shou'd be necessary for the tranquillity and comfort of his kind and affectionate friends and guardians (yourself and Mrs. Sparry), we agree. Inclos'd, my dear sir, you will find what I am sure must be become quite necessary—a draft on Messers. Coutts for 100*l.* With respect to Dr. Glyn, you will, if you please, do what you wou'd naturally do, and we shall see upon conferring together what further steps may be proper to be taken. Some gout still remains, but nothing more than the remnant of the last fit, which continues going off kindly. You know how many wishes attend ye, and I hope are assured of the truth with which I am, dear sir,

Your affectionate and faithfull

HESTER CHATHAM.

A whole collection of kind loves to dear William.

Burton Pynsent : Dec. 1, 1773.

The last Cambridge mail, my dear sir, brought us treasures of comfort and joy. The prosperous manner in which dear William was advancing in his recovery, and the important trial of the chaise having been made with such complete success, gave us the possible satisfaction on the article of health. The favor of Doctor Browne's most obliging and delightful letter to my Lord inspired a heartfelt pleasure of another sort. The account it gives of the prosperity of our charming boy's behaviour, and the opinion with which Doctor Browne honors him in consequence, fills all our wishes for him. Our satisfaction is inexpressible that, in the little time allowed him by his mortifying illness to manifest his disposition and powers, he shou'd be happy enough to have given such favorable impressions of himself, and to have rendered partial to him those persons who honor him with attention and care. The predictions framed of him are flattering in the highest degree. You will believe with what an overflowing joy we read the sentiments Doctor

Browne conveyed in his letter. I must add that we read it, too, with the highest admiration, which I assure you wou'd not have been less had we not at all been interested in the subject, for, independant of what we feel from it, it is so truly fine that we must always have given an equal praise to it. My Lord is extremely sorry that the present lameness of his gout obliges him to defer the great satisfaction he shou'd have in acknowledging it, which he desires you will explain, with his best compliments, to Doctor Browne.

I begin to be in some doubt, since the propitious success of the driving, whether you will not have been set out on your slow wheels, and begin your journey before my last of the 28th can have reached you, which enclos'd materials I imagine to be highly necessary for the prosecution of your travels, a draft on Messers. Coutts for 100*l.* If you shou'd not have received it, we figure to ourselves you can only beg your way. Luckily, you have a tolerably clever party, and so may have some chance of success. . . .

Ever yours faithfully,

HESTER CHATHAM.

Burton Pynsent : Dec. 18, 1773.

My dear Sir,—I have the greatest pleasure in the world in making myself the hand to convey to you the happiness you will receive from the knowledge of our dear William's safe arrival with his little convoy of faithful attendants. Thursday, at somewhat past two, the joyfull meeting took place with mother and Sister Hester in the High Street of Langfort—a street which for the future I shall visit with far greater pleasure than if its walls were built by Palladio and consecrated by ancient fame. This modern event will render it never to be forgotten by those who shared in the inexpressible satisfaction of that moment. The sensation of father and brothers and sister, and home, were not less lively and touching than those felt by us, as you will easily believe. Happiness spread itself through Burton House. Need you be assured that in the midst of it Mr. Wilson was remembered with every sentiment due to his zealous attachment and to his affectionate

care of his young friend. It was impossible to have a higher sense than my Lord and myself have on this ocassion, of which we shall most certainly always preserve the most gratefull remembrance, and shall be truly happy to be able to pay it by something more essential than words. Now let me tell you that we found the looks and whole appearance of your sweet boy much better than we had expected. He bore his journey without fatigue, mended on the road, and has slept well, eat well, and been in excellent spirits to the present writing. He wou'd have writ himself to you, but I insisted upon the office, and he employs his pen in giving an account of his arrival to Doctor Browne and Doctor Glynne. . . . Most affectionate compliments from hence to you.

Your faithfull friend and affectionate servant,

HESTER CHATHAM.

The following to her son is full of a mother's tender, anxious care :

Hayes: Wednesday, Sept. 14, 1774.

A gloomy skie and premature winter admonishes, my dearest William, the careful minds of father and mother to convey to you a few hints on what the season may require, and which otherwise, perhaps, while you look through the clouds and trace the mystic spheres, might escape your attention. We wish you to think of the guards that cold and damp render necessary, and, of course, not wise to neglect, such as buttoning up against the rigours of the north-east, putting on stouter shoes and warmer stockings, against humidity of damp, raw air, and keeping it out of one's chambers by occasional fires. Also to have a proper regard to the influence of night air, and not to expose one's self to the chance of its disagreeable effects. These are the grand points recomended. You can extend your observation to the different branches that belong to each, if any there be. We trust, my loved William, a kind attention to our ease, with the noble desire of preserving the ability to pursue your elevated course of action, as well as scientific knowledge, will engage you not to slight such simple advice. With a regular practice of these sage rules health will be preserved,

and the fields of learning will be play fields to our excellent youth. Enough on this. Let me now express with how much pleasure my Lord and I read Mr. Wilson's letter of this morning. The sentiments convey'd by it naturally afforded much satisfaction to us both, who will always find a real happiness in being able any way to contribute to his. It is flattering to know that expression of our sense of his merits can contribute to it. He may be assured that it will be lasting, and ever accompanied with a sincere desire to serve him. This letter will, I believe, but just catch him with you. Both of you feel, I daresay, the near approach of the parting moment. The compensation of both will be from the fame of your good government of yourself, which will reflect back to Mr. Wilson and forward on you, my much-admired boy. You will scarce believe that I regret the time when I am writing to you, but I want to go and make my compliments to Mrs. Wilson, Mrs. Giffin, the celebrated Giffy, and stout Gloucester, who are all drinking tea with your sisters. . . . Many kind loves to your sweet self, with many compliments to Mr. Wilson, finishes the present, and I remain always, my dearest William,

Your most affectionate mother,

HESTER CHATHAM.

The next letter is to Mr. Wilson :

Hayes : Thursday, Feb. 20, 1775.

. . . I know nothing in general of Mr. Williann's correspondence and yours, but I think he will not have omitted to tell you that he has been indulged with the supreme pleasure of being in the House of Lords on some of the most important debates. I need not tell you what gainers the ladies at home have been by it. You know the gentleman's accuracy well enough to make that a clear point to you. He has made a very good ten days' campaign in London besides, and so has your younger friend, Mr. James, tho' not of so long a date. They continue the agreeable habit of attracting favorable remarks from whatever company they happen to fall into, and so return to their learned avocations happy and pleas'd. Our young Viscountess<sup>1</sup> takes to her London life with great propriety, and is enough to

<sup>1</sup> Her eldest daughter, Lady Mahon.

make those vain who belong to her, which you must hear with some satisfaction. My companion, lively Madame Harriot, grows very tall, but as she grows pleasing and amiable in the same proportion it is perfectly well. You see I write to you in the persuasion that these particulars of your former pupils will be as interesting as ever, and spread a pleasure through your new dwelling. You wou'd be greatly edified, I am sure, in seeing the new works of *our* Homer, who, for the purpose of making water meadows, has formed a regular river of the Bone from the Bridge to the Alders, the effect of which is, even at present, delightfull, and when my Lord comes to shape it more exactly by the line of grace it will be enchanting.

The mother's<sup>1</sup> letters to her son William show how she strove to keep him informed on all home and other matters that she thought would interest a student at Cambridge.

Hayes: Wednesday, Aug. 10, 1774.

If my sketch of the rural celebration at which we assisted, my dear William, afforded you any entertainment and furnished some degree of satisfaction to that busy thing called curiosity, I am most agreeably paid for the *trouble* of employing my pen. By your answer to me I perceive that *between* the accomplishments of learned and genteel you have included whatever is to be ranged under classes too extensive to be embraced by most mortal powers. Some you have known come pretty near, perhaps, to such wonderful beings, but a love of virtue, passion for right, and an active, energetic mind are enough to compose a *total* greatly to be approved. Your imagination is so very fertile that it must have a line given it, or else what deserves to be admired would lose by sad comparison. You will unriddle this mysterious information better than your memory served you to

<sup>1</sup> There are excellent portraits of Lord and Lady Chatham at Orwell Park. William Pitt strongly resembled his mother, but I could not see in any of his likenesses any trace of his father's features.

discover what I meant when I gave you the account of my having read the heroic epistle with the postscript. I think by this time you will have observed that the correspondence between the home party here and Cambridge is a little infected with the deadening influence of the diminution of our gay companions and their lively conversation. We seem more engaged, and to be mixed more in what belongs to the world, than when we dwelt upon our distant hill at Burton Pynsent, but somehow or other nothing that is not too trifling or too serious for the matter of a little occurs. We are all now upon the brink of expectation as to what will be the event of the Kentish meeting to-morrow at Maidstone for the nomination of the future representatives, which of all things appears, at this present time, to be the most unsettled from the particular circumstances of the country itself, and of the leading persons in it. I hope you read with pleasure how our long-formed *cricketters* beat Hampshire out and out. The D. of Dr. laboured in the field with the most unremitting order. F. assures us that victory was secured by the deeds of his Grace and one other equally stout and skilful champion. If the papers have told you that P. Camden has been ill they will have told you but too true. He has had repeated attacks of cramp in his stomach, and they have been followed by a jaundice, of which he continues to be extremely out of order. My Lord has seen him two or three times. You would not suppose that visiting was so much a fashion with us that my Lord has been forced to invite some of his neighbours to take a farmer's dinner with us in order to make a meeting certain. Mr. and Mrs. Townshend, of Chiselhurst, have been of the number. You will see what a happy contagion has extended itself from the capital to Hayes. What will you not expect after this? I suppose my lord should become Macaroni, and I a [illegible], which, considering my present shape, would not be less extraordinary than his growing into the former. We are at present under the serious contemplation of a journey to Stowe, and I am rather inclined to think that unless *gout* declares a veto, it will take place soon. Having named *gout*, you will not wonder if the doctor's idea should present itself

next to me. He is at his farm in Devonshire, from whence he has made a visit to Mr. and Mrs. Hood at Lynn. He is in high spirits, having just carried a cause that confirms a claim of sole right of common way important to his estate, and which was disputed by a litigious parishioner. He enquires with the warmth of an ordinary friend of my loved William. I gave him yesterday a good account of your health, and, by way of confirmation, informed him you were courting all the ladies of Parnassus at once with a lover's ardour. I hope I rather boasted, for I must own I think the number would be too great for any *prudent* youth at *once*. I trust I need not say a serious word to my ardent boy to prevail with him to suit his scientific, historic, poetic march to the degree of his youthful strength, or to engage him to remember that *losing* of time is gaining in the strictest sense for him. Pam has not failed to address her Wednesday's enquiry to Mrs. Wilson. We have the happiness to hear, in return, that you are perfectly well. The greatest news from Homer's Fields is that we are going to convert two bad horses into one good one. Robina's bay is come with Pear, and we shall part with limping and flying Algebra. To make the acquisition will be pleasure, if not profit, but we hope to unite both, if people prove good jockeys.

Receive, my dearest William, from father, mother and sisters as much love and affection as words can convey. Your faithful friend Pam desires you to accept of her zeal for your health and happiness. Pray make the kindest compliments from each of our society to Mr. Wilson. I hope he is proof against the strength of the Peacock's shoulder.<sup>1</sup>

(No signature. Franked by Lord Chatham.)

Hayes: Sept. 21, 1774.

I was extremely pleased with your amiable letter, my dear William, but since the contents would not admit of your having any doubts of that being the consequence, I should not write *only* to assure you of it. My present view is to send you the

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*

enclosed paper, the original of which came accidentally to my hands. We think that certainly it belongs to you *by right*, and are great admirers of all the fine things it records. We know your great modesty, and therefore do not wonder you never have arrogated them to yourself, though for my part I own I think you must sometimes have boasted of them. It is true that when people are so superior (as it is proved the Parson must be) who performed all those wonders that they are never apt to talk of their own doings, and that accounts for our not having heard you make any brags upon the subject; for otherwise nobody acquainted with you but would agree that you were naturally born to such high deeds. Let your modesty be as great as it will, I am sure you will have infinite pride and satisfaction in it, and entirely forgive the generous panegyric having taken such liberties with your name of *William Pitt*. I think your cousin candidate, with all his fresh-blown honours full upon him, would feel his vanity still increased by the sense of having a claim in blood with such an extraordinary person. We have a great respect for the disinterested and patriotic spirit of the honest victor of Cambridge; it seems as if those harmonious daughters, the friends of liberty, to whom you offer daily your vows for inspiring knowledge, had infused a part of their sacred fire into those heroes of public zeal. Mr. Byde and Mr. Muk have our good wishes for success on the decisive day. Mr. Wilson will, most probably, have *notified* to you his safe arrival at Pickhurst Green. A rendezvous had been appointed by Mr. Wilson in town on the Sunday morning, but to prove himself as well versed in the school of attention as she, with a preventive gallantry stole home in the dusk of the evening, and did not expose the joy of meeting to the public eye as before. On Saturday morning I found him, much to my surprise, at breakfast with his friend, Mr. James, and your two sisters. Questions followed one another very fast on the subject of the dear person he left behind. The answers were such as gave full satisfaction, and made father and mother admire and love their excelling son still more and more. We were happy to find that your weather had been many degrees better than ours, and that you have

been able to enjoy the advantage and amusement of your horse. I hope the same difference will still subsist, for here at least every other day is too bad for being abroad. We feel it less than in any former time by having so seldom any solitary time. I am to tell you that Miss Chapman, urged by the ambition of enjoying the honour of having the work of her skilful hand worn by the celebrated Mr. Pitt, has already finished your waistcoat and sent it to Hayes; it is very much approved by those ladies of taste, your sisters. For my Lord and myself, we have not yet seen it nor passed our judgment upon it. Our young Westminster friend presses his point with an animation and sagacity that I think must be crowned with success. He comes to recruit from his labors in our pastoral scenes, which present softer ideas than the dirty streets of London. I conclude with many thanks to you for the letter already named by me, and by desiring, as well as I like it, that it may be some time before I receive any in answer to this. A line sometimes to your sisters, for information of your health, will be sufficient for the satisfaction of all. Love in full measure from all.

Your most affectionate mother,

H. CHATHAM.<sup>1</sup>

Pam's duty and acknowledgements. She is well; the rest so, except James, and he much mended. Cash particulars shall be settled in time. I do not yet know them from Mr. Wilson.

<sup>1</sup> *Pretyman MSS.* The whole tone of the mother's letters to this gifted son indicated not only respect for his precocious mind, but also that she well knew of his vivacity and liveliness. There is little to support Windham's statement 'that Pitt never was a boy.' He was always fond of round games with children, and played at speculation with the eagerness of a child (Bell's *Life of Canning*). Wilberforce (*Life*, i. 28) records 'the foinings in the garden at Wimbledon, where Pitt's overflowing spirits carried him to every height of jest;' and adds: 'We found one morning the fruits of Pitt's earlier rising in the careful sowing of the garden beds with the fragments of a dress-hat, in which Ryder had overnight come down from the opera.' His connection with the Goostree Club did not show any want of youthful enterprise. Its twenty-five members comprised many bright and lively young men, including Windham himself.

*Copy of Paper referred to above.*

COPY of an inscription on a root-house at Mr. Pothill's, at Chipstead, 1773, from whence is a view of a pyramid erected by Sir Jeffrey Amherst at Montreal :

YONDER OBELISK  
WAS ERECTED ON HIS PATERNAL LANDS  
BY  
SIR GEOFFREY AMHERST  
TO COMMEMORATE  
THE CONQUEST GAINED IN AMERICA.  
LOSING NOT A THOUGHT ON THE PRESENT TIMES,  
READER,  
SUFFER THY MIND TO REVOLVE ON THAT  
GLORIOUS PERIOD OF THE REIGN OF  
GEORGE THE SECOND,  
DURING THE ADMINISTRATION OF  
WILLIAM Pitt,  
WHEN THE UPRIGHT VIEWS OF THE  
SOVEREIGN,  
JOINED TO THE WISDOM AND GREAT ABILITIES  
OF THE MINISTER,  
INSPIRED  
A CONFIDENCE SO FORTUNATE AND UNIVERSAL  
AS TO TURN EVEN THE SPIRIT OF PARTY  
INTO ZEAL FOR THE PUBLIC WELFARE,  
AND BY GIVING A TOTAL CHANGE TO OUR AFFAIRS  
RESCUED THIS NATION FROM THE BRINK OF RUIN.

• • •  
INSCRIBED  
BY A FRIEND TO VIRTUE  
AND A LOVER OF HIS  
COUNTRY.

The answer of William Pitt showed, at all events, a grateful sense of his mother's permission for him to defer his reply :

Pembroke Hall: Sept. 24, 1774.

My dear Mother,—It is needless to tell you what pleasure I received from your most kind letter, or to thank you for your goodness in giving me the liberty to defer answering it. Waving those articles, as well as the title you have indulged me with to remain silent, I beg to address a word to you, rather than anyone else, to acknowledge my having enjoyed the pleasure intended me from the paper you enclosed. I was charmed with what you call the liberties taken with my name.

I shall at least be happy in a claim of blood to remember the glories that once accompanied it; and it will be my ambition not to injure them.

Without endeavouring further to express faintly the strong ideas that present themselves, I shall avail myself of your indulgence to close this letter, and join to this honourable name the pleasing title that I am, my dear mother,

Your ever-dutiful and affectionate son,

WILLIAM PITT.<sup>1</sup>

The next letter<sup>2</sup> is the first from his pupil to Dr. Pretyman (according to the endorsement of the Bishop), and is noteworthy as showing such a keen interest in elections by a boy of fifteen :

Hayes: Oct. 7, 1774.

Dear Sir,—I arrived at this place to dinner on Wednesday, though considerably later than I intended. I had not proceeded far from Nockerill before I discovered that one of my horses had mistaken his business, and was harnessed to the chaise instead of his accustomed plough. In this condition I was dragged slowly to Epping, from thence to London. I went rapidly enough, but when I arrived at the inn I was directed to, I learned that all the horses were gone out canvassing for elections; however, with difficulty some were procured, and after another half-hour delay from coaches and carts in the City I reached my journey's end after 3 o'clock.

You arrived, I hope, at Cambridge with less delay and fewer

<sup>1</sup> Chatham Correspondence.

<sup>2</sup> Pretyman MSS.

stupid adventures, and did not increase your cold by giving me the pleasure of your company. I can furnish no more news than what the papers will have informed you of as to Westminster, and you will also have seen the numerous advertisements from London. They seemed to be in no bustle there when I passed through, and there were scarce any signs of an election. I depend on your goodness, and indeed your promise, to let me hear how you all go on at Cambridge, and to give me an account of the great business of election both from town and University.

Adieu, my dear Sir. Be so good as to present my best compliments to the master and your whole society, and believe me

Your affectionate, faithful friend,

WILLIAM Pitt.

The following<sup>1</sup> is an extraordinarily formal and verbose production from a youth of sixteen :

March 16, 1775.

My dear Sir,—Though I should in many instances feel great pleasure in following your example, I will not do it so implicitly as to admit of no exception in the article of letter-writing, because, though I am so unfortunate as not to hear from you so often as I wish, I will not refuse myself the pleasure of writing to you whenever I have an opportunity. I do not mean to complain by this of the long intervals in our correspondence, as I am so well acquainted with your avocations as to think myself happy in your finding any leisure to keep it up at all; but I only wish not to be precluded from the privilege of thanking you as speedily as possible for your obliging letters. You are exceedingly kind in wishing to see me in College, and I assure you I should be happy to rejoin your society. I shall not, however, this post give you the trouble of recommending it to Bleak to prepare my rooms immediately, though I hope before long to apply myself to you with that view. My health has not suffered the least this winter, and therefore you must reasonably conclude that it will not suffer from passing the spring at Cambridge. My inclinations will accelerate the experiment as much as pos-

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*

sible. I sympathise with you and the master on the straying of the lost sheep of the Fens of Ely, whose case seems desperate, if your various fund of sermons has not enabled you to reclaim them. How happy must you have been made by the company of Mr. Wilgress, whose presence will have thrown an enlivening gleam into the parlor! I have not had the extreme honour and happiness of seeing him, so that your conjectures on that head are groundless.

I will now come to a conclusion, and for doing so I will make no other apology than that I have nothing to say that could amuse you, and therefore the sooner I come to an end, the better.

Adieu, my dear Sir, then, and believe me, with great truth,  
Your affectionate, humble servant,

W. Pitt.

Excuse blots and confusion in these hasty lines.

Lady Chatham plainly always wrote most tender and motherly letters to her son, with family news and political subjects combined, so as to suit his taste :

Hayes: Tuesday, July 18, 1775.

You will have been able but too well, my dear William, to have accounted for my having suffered your amiable letters to remain without being answered to this time. Would to God that I could send you news in this that might be a compensation for my silence; but Heaven does not yet think fit to grant our prayers, and send the blessing of health where it is so much wanted. Your father for some time past has certainly had no marks of amendment, nor is there at present any signs of gout being in motion towards the extremities.

This throws our hopes of recovery to a greater distance, and offers the prospect of a distressing interval. Our skilful doctor preserves his confidence that all will be well with time, but in low, lingering complaints it is difficult to fix the period when the relief will come. It is to no purpose to repeat how cruel the circumstance of his illness is. The public events of every day prove it so for his country, and everything combined together for his family and friends. However, my dear William, let us

trust in a gracious Providence and hold fast (to borrow an expression from Mr. Hood) the anchor of hope. Let us add to it fortitude and prudence, which are the best supports and defence against misfortunes of all sorts. I should have the greatest joy possible in having you with me for a few days; but having weighed it, I think difficulties may arise in consequence which may make it wiser to forego for the present your purpose of coming. You may trust to my reasons being good against it, for you have a strong friend in my inclination to persuade me to agree to your plan, but it is certainly better to decide against it.

Should any favourable change of circumstances happen to make it eligible, you shall hear instantly from me. I own I wish you could make some little excursion, as change of air and place are good, undoubtedly, for health, and dissipate the mind properly. Could not you get Mr. Pretyman, your friend Dr. G., or some other person—for I name at random—to go a party with you of four or five days, to see places that have something worth seeing? Windsor, I think, you did see. You know nobody at the other University (the Addingtons are not there), and you would, besides, be too near Walton not to go there, which would not be to be chose at present. If any agreeable idea that is *not too expensive* occurs, follow it; that is all I can say further. The news from Canada is of a very anxious thought. I know, by a private letter, that your brother is with General Carleton at Montreal (since at St. John's), and that as for the third of June the General acted only on the defensive. I flatter myself he will still continue to do so, as his force is very weak in proportion to Col. Arnold, who is in possession of Ticonderoga with fifteen hundred Provincials under his command, and who has with him an engineer who has fortified the port. As some of the Provincial Congresses have issued (as you will have read in the papers) strong positive orders that the *Canadians* should not be molested under the severest penalties, I trust matters will be kept quiet, at least till answers shall be returned from England to the proposals of the general Continental Congress, which soon must sure arrive. What I have been now writing to you I have not mentioned to anybody, much

less your father, who is by no means strong enough for such news. I reckon *my letters* will have reached your brother by this time. He will be the judge, circumstanced as he is, what will be consistent with his honour. You will take no notice of this subject in your letters to anybody, as I say nothing upon it. Your sister Harriot goes to-morrow to Chevening, to continue there till Lady's arrival shall dislodge her, which may be the end of this month or the beginning of next. I have great satisfaction in her going, as she will be happy with her sister, and I can see but very little of her. Our young noble friend, as the Doctor calls him, wants exceedingly to come to me, since he cannot come to my Lord. I have declined it, and wished him to write if there was anything I could answer. I rejoice to find you continue well. I hope you are honest in your accounts of yourself. Your favourite palfrey, Nutmeg, is returned from his purgative feeding in appearance sound and in great spirits. He was brought only Sunday night. I guess you will hardly have a desire to change, should you find him [illegible] well. Pam has been ill, but is recovering very fast, and goes abroad. I have given you the utmost time I can, so God bless you, my dearest William.

Your most truly loving mother,

HESTER CHATHAM.<sup>1</sup>

What do you think of an entry this morning of Mrs. L—'s two daughters, accompanied by a page belonging to the Royal Nursery from Kew? I thought the ladies *somewhat* too free in their visit, and so sent them directly away with their gentleman. Was not I right?

To the Hon. William Pitt,  
Pembroke Hall, Cambridge.

Pitt took his degree in 1776 in the ordinary way as a nobleman's son, his health precluding him from making any effort to distinguish himself at an examination. He continued to live at Cambridge<sup>2</sup> for four

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*

<sup>2</sup> Pitt's rooms at Pembroke Hall were on the first-floor of 'F,' in Ivy Court, and consisted of a fine large wainscoted sitting-room, occupying

years longer, his residence there lasting in all for seven years. During his later years there he participated in the attractive society of the University, and made many friendships,<sup>1</sup> which lasted through life. He was very bright and agreeable in society, and always ‘the most lively person in company, abounding in playful wit and quiet repartee.’

He also occasionally visited London, and when there attended the Houses of Parliament, particularly the House of Lords, whenever his father was going to speak. His letters to Lady Chatham describing the impressions his father’s speeches produced are printed in the ‘Chatham Correspondence,’ and show the great influence that the marvellous oratory of Chatham had on his son. The last pathetic scene in the House of Lords found him at his father’s side, and the absence of his elder brother gave him at the funeral of Lord Chatham the sadly prominent position of chief mourner in the state ceremonial in Westminster Abbey. He was deeply touched by all the incidents of that trying time, and by the sympathy which poured in on all sides. His letter to Dr. Pretyman on the occasion is marked by gratitude and dignity :

the whole width of the building, having windows on both sides; and quite a small bedroom adjoining. The rooms had been occupied by Gray, the poet. The College has three large manuscript volumes of the poet in his clear, beautiful writing, having all his poems and many miscellaneous writings, with very full and detailed notes.

<sup>1</sup> *Pretyman MSS.* In the Bishop’s manuscript fragment of a Life of Pitt he mentions as his intimate friends at Cambridge ‘Mr. Elliott, Mr. Banks, Lord Westmorland, Lord Euston, Mr. Pratt (Camden), Mr. Lowther (Lonsdale), Mr. Long, and Mr. St. John.’ He must also have met there Lord Granby (Rutland), a great friend, who left him 3,000*l.* by his will, and also appointed him one of his executors and guardian to his children.

Hayes : Saturday, May 16, 1778.

Dear<sup>1</sup> Pretyman,—I am truly obliged to you for your friendly and affectionate concern for me on this distressful occasion. The loss I have sustained is indeed irreparable, and my feelings in consequence are what no words can convey. At the same time, the shock was the less dreadful as I had so long been prepared to expect it. It has had no bad effect on my health, and though I know how vain it is to resist the first impressions of sorrow, I do not suffer my mind to be dejected. Every consideration that can raise and support it under such afflicting circumstances is afforded me by the public steps that have been taken to confer the most signal honours on my poor father's memory and the most distinguished benefits on his family. I am doubly obliged to you for extending your friendly anxiety to all my family, and have the comfort to tell you that they are all in good health. You shall hear from me again as soon as I have it in my power to determine when I may expect the satisfaction of seeing you at Cambridge. In the meantime be persuaded that I am inexpressibly sensible to your goodness, and am, with every sentiment of friendship and affection,

Faithfully yours,

W. Pitt.<sup>2</sup>

Unfortunately, there are no letters forthcoming of the Pitt children to each other. One of the few letters<sup>3</sup> of his youngest sister, Lady Harriot Elliott, in existence contains some words which show that William Pitt was careless on a subject which usually interests people a good deal—the return of a birthday: ‘To-morrow is William’s birthday. I believe he don’t know it himself, or rather does not think of it, but I could not help talking of it to you.’

Pitt was probably enabled to overcome any in-

<sup>1</sup> Probably ‘Doctor’ was accidentally omitted. <sup>2</sup> *Pretyman MSS.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* The letter is addressed to Mrs. Pretyman, and is a good deal frayed.

capacity to be equal to his work which his health might cause by his power of putting aside trouble and always sleeping well. Lord Liverpool<sup>1</sup> records: ‘It is a singular circumstance that I never saw any public man who appeared so little desponding, or who bore up so firmly against misfortunes. He had, particularly, the faculty of laying his cares aside, of amusing himself with an idle book or a comparatively trivial conversation at the times he was engaged in the most important business, and I have heard him say that no anxiety or calamity had ever seriously affected his sleep.’<sup>2</sup>

His father’s death found Pitt equipped with a well-stored mind ; with an ample education, including a wide knowledge of the classics, of history, of civil law, and political economy ; and also a splendid training for oratory and for public life, added to a teaching which had ever held aloft the purest and worthiest ideals—a love for what was just and elevated, a scorn for what was mean and sordid. Chatham left, however, with these great endowments but a slender fortune to William. The nation had taken care of his widow and his eldest son, and granted 20,000*l.* for the payment of his debts, but he himself had been only able to leave his darling second son between 250*l.* and 300*l.* a year.<sup>3</sup> It

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.* Lord Liverpool, when returning Sir W. Farquhar’s account of his treatment of Pitt, 1795–1806.

<sup>2</sup> Wilberforce has also recorded that ‘he was never harassed or distressed by public affairs,’ and also that ‘his inward emotions never clouded his temper or affected his spirits’ (*Private Papers of W. Wilberforce*. 1897. Fisher Unwin).

<sup>3</sup> Giffard, in his *Life of Pitt*, says that his fortune was 10,000*l.*; but Wraxall says it was only 5,000*l.*, in addition to the 3,000*l.* Rutland legacy. Pitt had on several occasions to lament the want of independent means—on the resignation of Shelburne, on the madness of George III.

was intended that he should go to the Bar, and after his father's death it was decided that he should, if possible, purchase chambers in Lincoln's Inn. The price asked for some that he liked was 1,100*l.*, described by the future Chancellor of the Exchequer as 'a frightful sum.' The chambers were purchased with the aid of his uncle, and he resided there for some time, occasionally attending the debates in the House of Commons as a 'stranger.'

Pitt was called to the Bar, and joined the Western Circuit. He got a little business, and in the short time that he followed the profession he obtained a moderate measure of success. It is probable that if he had given a devoted allegiance to the law he would have reached a high position, taking into account his great attainments and the prestige of his name. His Bar training must have been of use to him all through his life, preventing him from being frightened by law points, although he thought very modestly of his own legal attainments.<sup>1</sup> But his whole mind was turned to politics, and his eyes were ever on the House of Commons. Accordingly, when Parliament was dissolved on September 1, 1780, he boldly stood for the University of Cambridge, and told his mother the result in the following short letter :

in 1788, and on his own resignation in 1801; whilst it probably was the principal obstacle to his seeking to become engaged in January 1797.

<sup>1</sup> In his speech of March 12, 1801, he said: 'In truth, although bred to a learned profession in a very early part of my life, I had but a short acquaintance with it—enough, however, to admire the excellence of it, but not enough to make me despise any other system which the necessities of a State may require.'

Pembroke Hall: Sept. 16, 1780.

My dear Mother,—Mansfield and Townshend have run away with the prize, but my struggle has not been dishonourable.

I am just going to Cheveley for a day or two, and shall soon return to you for as long as the law will permit, which will now be probably the sole object with me.

I hope you are all well.

Your ever-dutiful and affectionate

W. Pitt.<sup>1</sup>

But his ‘sole object’ was the House of Commons, and accordingly within three months he was, on the nomination of Sir James Lowther, member for Appleby, and entered the House of Commons in January 1781.

This opened for him that great career which occupied all the rest of his life.

One can readily realise the deep interest that was on all sides felt on the first appearance of this favourite son of Chatham. He made his mark at once. His first speech was made a month after he had taken his seat, on a motion of Edmund Burke for economical reform, and it was a distinct success.<sup>2</sup> No one was more loud in its praise than Fox, destined to be the rival of his life. One can well understand the hearty and generous welcome which the great orator

<sup>1</sup> Stanhope's *Life of Pitt*, i. 45.

<sup>2</sup> George Selwyn's estimate was not so high: ‘To give him credit for being very extraordinary upon what I heard yesterday would be absurd. If the oration had been pronounced equally by a young man whose name was not of the same renown, all which could have been said was that he was a sensible and promising young man. There is no fairer way of judging.’ But Lord North declared it to be the best first speech he had ever heard made by a young man (*Hist. MSS. Com.*, ‘Lord Carlisle,’ xxv.). Burke, too, was much impressed, and said: ‘It is not a chip of the old block: it is the old block itself.’ Fox's tribute is well known. To one who said, ‘Pitt will be one of the first men in Parliament,’ he at once replied, ‘He is so already.’

of established fame would extend to the young man who had just made his first speech. It is what one would expect from the frank and genial nature of Fox, particularly to the son of another of England's greatest Parliamentary orators, and who had just shown himself capable of making, at his first trial, an effective debating speech.

When Rockingham succeeded North, he offered Pitt a dignified and highly paid office, which he proudly refused, having determined not to take 'a subordinate office.' Had he then accepted place he would have commenced official life as the colleague of Fox, and this junction might have had a great influence on the political life of the next eighteen or twenty years. If these two great men—each a head and shoulders over all possible colleagues, putting Burke aside—had learned to work together, and had been associates instead of rivals and opponents, what changes would have been shown in the debates on home and Irish and foreign affairs! Lord John Russell was deeply impressed by the separation of the two great men, and says: 'Another evil consequence of the struggle of 1784 was that it separated for life the two men who were most fitted to guide the destinies of the country.'<sup>1</sup>

When Rockingham died, Fox refused to serve under Shelburne, the new Prime Minister. This refusal was certainly as much based on personal as on public grounds, but it led to momentous consequences to Fox and Pitt. Shelburne at once applied to Pitt, who consented, then being only twenty-three, to accept the

<sup>1</sup> *Life of C. J. Fox*, ii. 243.

office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, with practically the lead of the House of Commons ; while Fox went into Opposition, where, with the exception of the short and ignoble period of the coalition with North, and a few months at the close of his career, he was to spend the rest of his public life. There is no doubt that each knew and appreciated the other's great qualities. On the one occasion that they had a private meeting to discuss the continuation of the impeachment of Warren Hastings, their interview was gracious and cordial, but steadily through their lives they were resolute political antagonists.

Pitt was not in the least unduly elated by the great position thus so early acquired. His conduct during the short Administration of Lord Shelburne was marked by ability, resource and dignity. His name, his youth, his position, his future, commanded the attention and sympathy of the nation.<sup>1</sup> When the unworthy junction of the forces of Fox and North<sup>2</sup> upset the Shelburne Ministry, Pitt went calmly into Opposition, having declined the King's offer to make him Prime Minister. He availed himself of being free from office to pay his

<sup>1</sup> 'Pitt has the *monstrari digito* whenever he appears abroad here (Brighthelmstone), and, I believe, the real confidence of every man of every description' (Pulteney to the Duke of Rutland, August 1783. *Hist. MSS. Com.*, 'Rutland Correspondence,' iii. 70).

<sup>2</sup> George Selwyn gives a minute description of his impressions of Lord North : 'I see him in no light but of a Minister, and in that I see him full of defects, and of all men I ever sat down to dinner with the most disagreeable. But he is so in part from a scholastic, puritanical education, to which has been superadded the flattery of University persons, led captains, and Treasury dependants. Without this he would have been a pleasant companion. He has parts, information, and a good share of real wit, and is, I believe, not an ill-tempered man by any means' (*Hist. MSS. Com.*, 'Lord Carlisle's Papers,' xxvii.).

first and only visit to France, where he was treated with great distinction. The Coalition Government could not last, and it never commanded any confidence or respect. It was not reputable for Fox to be sitting as a colleague of North, whom he had assailed in the most savage way but a short time before, going even so far as to say that, if he ever made terms with him, he would be himself ‘the most infamous of mankind.’ It has been well said that Lord North readily forgave the uttering of these invectives, but the public never forgave their being retracted.

When Fox’s India Bill was defeated in the House of Lords, mainly owing to the King’s interference through Lord Temple,<sup>1</sup> George III.—as Ministers, relying upon their majority in the House of Commons, made no sign of resignation—took the grave and serious responsibility of himself dismissing the Government. He insisted on getting prompt possession of the seals of office, which were brought to him by the Under-Secretaries, Nepean and Frazer. If the King had not found a statesman willing to take their places, and with the stuff in him to command success, he would have been in the painful and awkward position of having again to apply to the two Ministers he had treated so haughtily.

But such a statesman was forthcoming in Pitt. Efforts were made to laugh down<sup>2</sup> the young and self-

<sup>1</sup> ‘His Majesty allows Earl Temple to say that whoever voted for the India Bill was not only not his friend, but would be considered by him as an enemy; and if these words were not strong enough, Earl Temple might use whatever words he deemed stronger and more to the purpose’ (*Courts and Cabinets of George III.* i. 288).

<sup>2</sup> Mrs. Crewe’s description was contemptuous: ‘It will be only a mince-pie Administration!’ Pitt’s first Ministry was composed as fol-

reliant Prime Minister who, in the winter of 1783, boldly took office in face of a large majority of the House of Commons, and who refused to dissolve until he thought the occasion suitable, calmly biding his time, watching the decreasing majorities against him on each division, and noting that public opinion out of doors was steadily coming to his side. His Ministry lasted for over seventeen years, and when he formed it he was himself the sole Cabinet Minister in the House of Commons to face Fox and North, Burke and Sheridan, and the whole power of the Opposition. Dundas was his most powerful colleague on the Treasury Bench, outside the Cabinet. Lord Temple's resignation a few hours after he had accepted office did Pitt no real harm. If he had continued a Minister, his conduct in bringing about the crisis would have been assailed, and it would have been hard to defend it. The circumstances of his rapid retirement are involved in some mystery, but they are not worth inquiring into. He may have been too timid or too grasping.

This was a great and dramatic position in English public life—this young Prime Minister of twenty-four, with the great name, taking the reins of government with perfect calmness and perfect self-reliance. The country waited with sympathetic curiosity, with keen interest, to see how Chatham's son would act, how he would bear himself, how he would succeed. The nation soon

lows: Pitt, First Lord of Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer; Lord Thurlow, Lord Chancellor; Earl Gower, President of Council; Duke of Rutland, Privy Seal; Lord Carmarthen and Lord Sidney; Secretaries of State; Duke of Richmond, Master of the Horse (not in Cabinet); Dundas and Grenville, Treasurer of the Navy and Paymaster.

realised that he was a man of commanding eloquence, of boundless resource, of rare capacity, and that he brought to the discharge of his vast responsibilities justified self-reliance, infinite patience, unfaltering dignity.

He soon showed that he was a great House of Commons man, a marvellous Parliamentary leader; always ready, always confident, ever clear and precise; a great debater as well as a great orator, with an extraordinary gift of rapid and effective arrangement<sup>1</sup> of his topics, and an unrivalled power of sarcasm. His manner was lofty and commanding, his diction elegant and perfect, his elocution impressive, his voice distinct, deep-toned and sonorous. He always profoundly impressed his audience. Opinions vary as to his style, but all concur in the effect of his oratory.<sup>2</sup> Windham says he had a 'state paper style'; but this is really a tribute to the dignity and completeness of his speeches. Brougham (no friendly critic) refers to the magical effect he wrought, to his lucid arrangement, to the majesty of his diction, to his unbending dignity of manner, and says that he spoke more as a ruler of the people than

<sup>1</sup> 'It was Pitt's habit to form the plan of a speech in his mind while the debate was going forward, and to distribute his comments on the various statements and remarks of his opponents according to the arrangement which he had made' (*Wilberforce's Private Papers*, 1897). He had an enormous memory and great self-reliance, which supported and strengthened the habit.

<sup>2</sup> Even his opponents admitted his powers, but sometimes in strange language. Lord Derby said, 'D—— the fellow! He speaks so well, I wish his throat was cut!' (*Hist. MSS. Com.*, 'Rutland Correspondence,' iii. 168). His action, however, was usually vehement, sometimes extravagant, and seldom graceful. He rarely spoke from notes, and those printed by Lord Stanhope only contain broad heads and divisions—no epithets, epigrams, sentences, or perorations, no trace of verbal preparation.

as an advocate or debater. His gifts were not confined to his speech. Canning says, ‘He had qualities rare in their separate excellence, wonderful in their combination.’ The purity and elevation of his sentiments, the fineness of his motives, his freedom from small and selfish objects, all impressed the nation; and when, shortly after his accession to power, he utterly put away the idea of making himself independent by taking the appointment of Clerk of the Pells, worth 3,000*l.* a year, and used it for a laudable public purpose, he at once commanded the respect of the nation, and retained it all through his life.

Truly might Gibbon say, ‘A youth of five-and-twenty, who raises himself to the government of an empire by the force of genius and the reputation of virtue, is a circumstance unparalleled in history, and, in a general view, not less glorious to the country than to himself.’ One of the greatest of our living statesmen,<sup>1</sup> impressed by his career, has expressed the judgment that ‘Pitt is by far the noblest figure in our political history.’

At the general election which was held in March 1784 Pitt had a large majority in the new Parliament, and was himself returned for Cambridge University, and retained the seat for life.

Thus, supported by a great popular vote, with a large majority in the House of Lords, and aided by the strong support of the King (ready to do anything to keep out Fox), Pitt applied himself to the great task of governing the Empire.

<sup>1</sup> The Duke of Argyll at Glasgow, January 15, 1895.

## CHAPTER II

## THE DUKE OF RUTLAND

Ability and education—Froude's estimate—His beautiful Duchess—Applies to Shelburne to influence Orde to become Chief Secretary—Orde—Shelburne—His nicknames—Condition of Ireland at Pitt's accession, political and Parliamentary—Commercial restraints—Pitt's summary—Woollen trade—Its destruction—Hely-Hutchinson's 'Commercial Restraints of Ireland'—Caused emigration of Ulster Protestants—Linen manufacture—Embargoes—Irish Parliament feeble—Petition for Union in 1703—Efforts to relieve trade—Literature asserted rights—Molyneux—Swift—Demand for Free Trade—Concessions—Constitutional danger—Constitution of 1782 imperfect—General condition of Ireland—Population—Hedge schools—Effect of penal laws—Peasantry of Ulster—Of other provinces—Mrs. Oliphant on effect of residence in Ireland—Duke of Rutland's Journal—'Ireland Sixty Years Ago'—Tarring and feathering—Police—Three classes of gentry—Life at Shane's Castle—Duelling—Abduction—Lord Clonmel's Diary—Drinking habits—Secret societies—Tithes—John FitzGibbon and John Beresford—'Beresford Correspondence'—Improvement of Dublin—Rutland mastered position—His letter to Pitt—Journey between London and Dublin—Loyal to Orde—Rutland's love of art—Sir Joshua Reynolds—Rutland's wine and cook—Thought highly of by his contemporaries.

CHARLES, fourth Duke of Rutland, who was selected by Pitt to be Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland,<sup>1</sup> was a man of ample ability, well educated, and a lover of art, en-

<sup>1</sup> The expenses of the Viceroyalty then, as now, were very great. Earl Temple, writing to the Duke of Rutland, January 11, 1784, says: 'In answer to your enquiries relating to the office, on a rough estimate my establishment would have required at least 15,000*l.* per annum, added to the present salary of 20,000*l.* I think you must calculate upon spending that sum from your private income. The sum of 3,000*l.* is always given for equipage money, and you will find your first expenses exceed that sum' (*Hist. MSS. Com.*, 'Rutland Correspondence,' iii. 73).



*The Duchess of Rutland.*



dowed with keen powers of observation and considerable resolution. Froude, speaking of him, says that ‘He died too soon to display qualities in a larger sphere which might have given him a place in the history of the Empire.’ He lived, however, long enough to show that he enjoyed Pitt’s confidence and friendship, and that he could, notwithstanding a great love for social pleasure, well acquit himself of the duties of an arduous position. He was well aided by his gifted Duchess, a daughter of the Duke of Beaufort, a lady of rare beauty, who gave much grace to his Court. She survived him for over forty years.

Pitt was about twenty-four when he became Prime Minister, and the Viceroy was still under thirty, and it is interesting to note the dignified, mature, and statesmanlike style of the correspondence between two such young men, filling two such great offices.

The Duke at first, and for a short time, held the dignified office of Lord Privy Seal, but he deemed it right to accept the arduous office of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland at the instance of Pitt.

He at once applied himself to find a suitable Chief Secretary, and requested<sup>1</sup> Lord Shelburne to use his influence with Orde to prevail on him to accept the office, saying that it was ‘an object of the last importance to the country in the present crisis that a person of his character and ability should be employed in that situation.’

Orde was an able and experienced public servant, being both Secretary of the Treasury and a member of

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

the English House of Commons, and it was natural that the Duke should desire the assistance of his official training and knowledge of affairs.

Orde accepted, and worked with the Viceroy most harmoniously and ably until the death of the Duke.

The Duke of Rutland must have been very intimate with Lord Shelburne to make an application to him in the first bitterness of his disappointment at not being asked to join, or even consulted as to, the new Government.

Shelburne was one of the ablest men of his day, who had held great office, been Prime Minister with Pitt as Chancellor of the Exchequer, before the Coalition Ministry was formed; and now George III., passing him by, had entrusted the task of forming a Government to Pitt, who left him severely alone,<sup>1</sup> whilst giving Cabinet office to men far inferior to him in ability.

This appears the more extraordinary because, when Shelburne was defeated by the startling junction of North and Fox, he had advised the King to send for Pitt, who now does not appear even to have consulted him. There may be some as yet unknown explanation of the position, but Lord Rosebery ascribes the apparent neglect of Shelburne to ‘the most inveterate distrust’ then associated with his name. His nicknames, ‘Jesuit’ and ‘Malagrida,’ certainly do not suggest that he would be a cordial and reliable colleague.

A man just left out of a Government is hardly the one to seek assistance from in completing its formation. The Duke of Rutland must not only have been on most

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Lord Shelburne*, by Lord E. Fitzmaurice, iii.

friendly terms with him, but also must have known that he was influential with Orde. At all events, Shelburne would appear to have complied with the request ; and Orde was always regarded as a *persona grata* with Shelburne. Pitt consulted him as to whether the title of marquis would be acceptable to his old chief. Whenever Orde visited Bath he generally also went to Bowood, and he was the medium of kind and friendly messages between its lord and the Viceroy.

It is most essential, in order to understand Pitt's position and difficulties, to thoroughly realise the political, commercial and social condition of Ireland at the time of his accession to office. There was in Ireland a Parliament newly constituted, proud of the possession of independent powers, with many sincere and genuine patriots and many sincere and genuine pensioners, and many who were ready to pass from one class to the other as their interests dictated. A shackled and fettered Parliament, subordinate to the English Parliament, had been tried. An independent Parliament—Protestant, loyal, composed mainly of the landed and aristocratic classes—was now to be tested, and to afford proof how far it could work not only for the good of Ireland, but in harmony with the general requirements of Great Britain and the Empire.

The commercial position of Ireland at Pitt's accession was interesting and novel.

Its restraints had been removed, the 'Free Trade' so long demanded had been conceded, and new Parliamentary powers had just been granted. But all had taken place very rapidly, and much remained to be

done in order to give an impetus to the backward trade, to stir the languid commerce of the country, and also to define and secure the imperial relations between the two countries.

The commercial restraints of the previous eighty years<sup>1</sup> must be realised in order to follow the spirit in which the past action of Great Britain was regarded, and the suspicions and jealousies which its memory had left behind.

Until 1663 the commerce and manufactures of Ireland were practically on the same footing and treated as favourably and protected as well as those of England. In that year, for the first time, a distinction was made and the uniformity of treatment ceased—and that, as Lord North said in 1779, ‘not directly, but by a side-wind and by deductive interpretation.’

The first Navigation Act of 1660 placed England and Ireland on a clear equality; but this Act was amended in 1663 by another English Act, and Ireland

<sup>1</sup> Pitt, in his speech on the Commercial Resolutions on February 22, 1785, thus summarised the record: ‘From the Revolution to a period within the memory of every man who heard him—indeed, until these very few years—the system had been that of debarring Ireland from the employment and use of her own resources; to make the kingdom completely subservient to the interests and opulence of this country, without suffering her to share in the bounties of Nature, in the industry of her citizens, or making them contribute to the general interests and protection of the Empire. This system of cruel and abominable restraint had, however, been exploded. It was at once harsh and unjust, and it was as impolitic as it was oppressive, and it promoted not the real prosperity and strength of the Empire. That which had been the system counteracted the kindness of Providence and impeded the industry and enterprise of man. Ireland was put under such restraint that she was shut out from every species of commerce. She was restrained from sending the produce of her own soil to foreign markets, and all correspondence with the colonies of Britain was prohibited to her’ (*Pitt's Speeches*. By Hathaway. London, 1806).

was then quietly omitted, thereby altering the commercial status of Ireland. All exports from Ireland to the Colonies, except victuals, servants, horses and salt, were prohibited; and the importation of Irish cattle into England was forbidden. Subsequent legislation sometimes rendered more stringent and sometimes relaxed this grave interference with the export of cattle. Irish shipping naturally suffered vastly from this restriction of such a large branch of trade, and much distress was felt, and would have been felt to a greater extent but for the resolute and vigorous exertions of the Duke of Ormonde, who was a patriotic Irishman, and who was then, fortunately, Viceroy, and on the best terms with Charles II.

The cattle trade being thus almost destroyed, the people turned themselves very largely to increase their flocks of sheep, and thus make additions to their stock of wool.

The woollen trade of Ireland dated back to early times, and was flourishing and progressive. The additions to the supply of wool were an advantage to the trade and found a ready market. The woollen manufacture became the greatest trade of Ireland. There does not appear, however, to have been any particular increase of the business in the reign of William III., but, nevertheless, it then excited specially apprehension and jealousy in England, although no effort was made to prejudice, much less to destroy it, until the year 1697.

In that year a Bill was brought into and passed the English House of Commons to prevent the exportation

from Ireland of woollen manufactures, but after some consideration was not passed by the House of Lords. The matter, however, was not allowed to drop, and in the year 1698 both the Houses of Parliament at Westminster addressed William III. to use his influence to check the growth and increase of the woollen manufacture in Ireland. The King accordingly wrote to Lord Galway, then one of the Lords Justices, to urge the matter on the Irish Parliament. The celebrated John Hely-Hutchinson, Provost, Secretary of State and M.P., in a remarkable series of letters (not avowed, but known to be his) written in August and September 1779—‘The Commercial Restraints of Ireland Considered,’<sup>1</sup> says : ‘It would be unjust to infer from any of these proceedings that this great Prince wanted affection for this country. They were times of party. He was often under the necessity of complying against his own opinion and wishes, and about this time was obliged to send away his favourite guards in compliance with the desire of the Commons.’ It is not a very attractive defence, but possibly it is as good as can be made.

The Lords Justices secured the passing, but not without opposition, of a Bill for laying an additional duty upon woollen manufactures exported out of Ireland. By this suicidal Irish Act (10 Will. III. c. 5) heavy prohibitive duties were laid on woollen goods, friezes only excepted, exported out of Ireland.

The measure struck a terrible blow at this great

<sup>1</sup> Carroll's edition, Dublin. Grattan said of Hely-Hutchinson : ‘He was the servant of many Governments, but he was an Irishman notwithstanding.’

branch of Irish trade ; however, it was, at all events, only passed for three years. But the English Parliament in 1699 passed a perpetual law prohibiting the exportation from Ireland of all goods made up or mixed with wool, except to England and Wales, and with the licence of the Commissioners of the Revenue. Duties had before been laid on the importation into England equal to a prohibition, therefore this Act operated as a total prohibition of the exportation.

This destruction of the woollen trade caused great distress in Ireland. The paralysis of one of its greatest industries naturally led to suffering and poverty, and deprived thousands of employment. It was computed that the business at the time of its suppression employed 12,000 families in Dublin and 30,000 in the rest of the kingdom. Its ruin caused a vast emigration, mostly of Protestants, of whom 20,000 left Ulster alone.<sup>1</sup> The revocation of the Edict of Nantes drove thousands of French Protestants out of France about the same time that the intolerance that killed the woollen trade drove thousands of Irish Protestants out of Ireland. It was a strange result, to see French Huguenots welcomed in Ireland, and Irish Protestants in France, assisting the commerce of their new countries against their old.

The linen manufacture was not equal to the woollen in either its extent or the amount of employment it gave, but it was considerable, and had shown always those elements of success which have now made Irish linen probably the best in the world.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Froude, *English in Ireland*, pp. 435-36.

<sup>2</sup> Even in 1787 the Irish linen was celebrated. ‘I know it to be the case that the French admire beyond all things the fineness of the Irish

When the Irish woollen trade was outlawed it was, however, promised that England would in every way develop, foster, and protect the Irish linen trade.

Ireland is not a manufacturing country. It was a grave thing to take away its most flourishing business, and leave it so largely dependent on the one trade of linen. That manufacture is liable, like all others, to vicissitudes, and in 1771–2–3 the Irish linen trade had bad times ; profits shrank, employment diminished, and there was great consequent distress. What a mitigation there would have been if the woollen business had then been thriving, earning, and employing !

The slowly growing glass trade of Ireland was also discouraged in the reign of George II. ; and Hely-Hutchinson<sup>1</sup> points out other interferences with Irish trade.

In addition to these restraints of trade, it must also be borne in mind that between 1740 and 1779 there were twenty-four embargoes in Ireland, one of which lasted three years, and that these ‘occasional’ interferences were often ruinous.

The unfortunate condition of Ireland obtained but little alleviation from the Irish Parliament,<sup>2</sup> which was

linen, which I dare say will have an immediate sale there. They are so nice in this article that a *blanchisseur* of credit will not send home an Englishman’s linen under a fortnight or three weeks’ whitening ; and on my complaining of it to a Norman servant, he said he believed she made a show of it’ (Pulteney to the Duke of Rutland. *Hist. MSS. Com.*, ‘Rutland,’ iii. 366).

<sup>1</sup> *Commercial Restraints*, p. 156.

<sup>2</sup> See *Irish Parliamentary Systems*, by the Right Hon. J. T. Ball, for a full history of the Irish Parliament, showing its varying conditions, and also the different areas from which its members from time to time came.

feeble and powerless. The Parliament in 1703, despairing, probably, of its own utility, as well as thinking that it would be best for the interests of Ireland to follow the recent example of Scotland, petitioned for a union. It was too soon. Opinion had not then developed sufficiently, and the English Government did not entertain the idea.

One of the very few measures to remedy commercial depression that the Irish Parliament succeeded in getting assent to was, in 1729, 'an Act to encourage the home consumption of wool by burying in wool only,' which had the curious and novel provision that no one should 'be buried in any stuff than what is made of sheep's or lamb's wool only,' a provision easily evaded, and not likely to be complied with unless supported by fashion or popularity. The Act of 1761 directing the inland carriage of corn was well meant and popular, but costly and indefensible.<sup>1</sup>

But literature asserted itself when Parliament was silent or incapable. The genius of great Irishmen, free outside the walls of Parliament, made and roused a public opinion, which each year made itself more felt, and later on encouraged generous minds in England as well as in Ireland, at Westminster as well as in Dublin.

Molyneux, member for Dublin University, a man much respected, and of great eminence, in his well-known book, 'The Case of Ireland's being bound by Acts of Parliament in England stated,' published in 1698, insisted that the Irish Parliament was indepen-

<sup>1</sup> Duke of Argyll on *Irish Nationalism*.

dent of that of England, and denounced in vigorous language the commercial injustice done to Ireland.

The work was widely read, and had a substantial effect on public opinion; but the authorities looked upon it as ‘dangerous,’ and it had the distinction of being ordered to be burned by the common hangman, which did not injure its popularity or circulation.

Swift’s celebrated ‘Drapier’s Letters’<sup>1</sup> raised the nation to a fury of patriotic excitement, and the great Dean of St. Patrick’s is regarded by many as the real founder of any public opinion in Ireland.<sup>2</sup>

Hely-Hutchinson, in the letters already referred to, with much wealth of language and with powerful iteration, traversed the whole field of Ireland’s commercial restrictions, and his indictment loses none of its power from its occasional courtier-like tones. It is said<sup>3</sup> that his work enjoyed the same fate as that of Molyneux, and was ordered to be burnt by the common hangman.

Notwithstanding, the writers made their mark, and kept alive a spirit which each day more resolutely

<sup>1</sup> Swift’s position in Irish public life is founded on these letters, and this would appear to have been his own view, for years after—in 1735—in his portrait by Bindon, painted for the Lord Howth of the day, and now in the hall at Howth Castle, he is represented as holding in his hand ‘the Drapier’s fourth letter to the whole people of Ireland,’ with the figure of Hibernia about to place a wreath upon his head, and trampling upon the prostrate figure of Wood, clinging to his patent, from which his coins are rolling. On July 6, 1735, Lord Howth, in a letter to Swift, writes: ‘I am very much obliged to my good Dean of St. Patrick’s for the honour he did me in sitting for his picture, and have wrote to Dr. Grattan to give Mr. Bindon strict charge in the finishing of it, and when that is done to bring it to his house, for fear I should get a copy instead of the original. My wife and all here join in their kind service to the Drapier.—I am, good Mr. Dean, your most assured and affectionate, humble servant, HOWTH.’

<sup>2</sup> Lecky’s *Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland*.

<sup>3</sup> MacNeill’s *Commercial Restraints*.

demanded ‘Free Trade.’ Then came the time of the Volunteers, and their motto, ‘Free Trade or ——,’ and the pressure of the Irish House of Commons and the speech of Hussey Burgh : ‘The English have sown their laws with serpents’ teeth, they have sprung up armed men.’

The Ministers determined to assent to what Lord Shelburne<sup>1</sup> diplomatically described, on December 1, 1779, as the ‘united voice of the country, conveyed through its proper constitutional channels, both Houses of Parliament.’

History, however, adds other reasons for the action of Lord North and his colleagues : the aspect of the Volunteers, the insistence of the Irish Parliament, the dread of bankruptcy in Ireland, the tremendous war then straining the resources of England ; and measures were rapidly passed far exceeding what the most sanguine hopes of Ireland ventured to put forward but a short time before.

The appearance of this change being obtained by force was unfortunate, and full of Constitutional danger. This view of the case found expression in the poetry of Ireland, and its voice is heard in the well known lines of Thomas Davis :<sup>2</sup>

And bless the men of patriot pen—  
Swift, Molyneux, and Lucas !  
Bless sword and gun, which Free Trade won,  
Bless God ! that ne’er forsook us !  
And long may last the friendship fast  
Which binds us all together :  
While we agree, our foes shall flee  
Like clouds in stormy weather !

<sup>1</sup> *Parliamentary Debates*, xiv. 85.

<sup>2</sup> See his *Song of the Volunteers* of 1782.

Ireland, after the commercial concessions, was also given in 1782 an independent Parliament, whose members knew the sad history of the restrictions just shaken off, and who, elated by a success for which they felt but little gratitude, looked forward to a future in which they might complete the work of the development of the trade and resources of the country.

But many difficulties still lay in the way, and required thought, consideration, and mutual concession ; for, as Froude<sup>1</sup> points out : ‘The Constitution of 1782 had been so hurried, it had left many things untouched. Ireland had free trade ; but who was to protect her trade, who was to represent her merchants abroad, under what system of duties were her exchanges with foreign countries to be regulated and her manufactures or raw products allowed privileges in the markets and passage through the Ports of England ?’

The general condition of Ireland was so entirely different at the time of Pitt’s accession to power from that which it is at present that it is difficult for *us* to realise what it *was*.

The population was in 1775 about two millions and a half.<sup>2</sup> The persons who resided in houses of one hearth were computed to be 1,877,220. ‘These find it very difficult to pay hearth money, and are thought to be unable to pay any other taxes.’ The general condition of the mass of the people must have been very poor ; they were wretchedly housed and miserably fed.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *English in Ireland*, ii. 421.

<sup>2</sup> Note to Carroll’s edition of Hely-Hutchinson’s *Commercial Restraints*.

<sup>3</sup> Arthur Young’s *Tour*.

Their standard of comfort and living must have been very low. They had no Royal Irish Constabulary to keep the peace ; no poor-law system to rely upon in sickness and in want ; a system of national education was not then thought of. The Irish have always respected letters and yearned for education, but they could only rely upon their ‘ hedge ’<sup>1</sup> schools, and casual and intermittent instruction given, it might be, by poor, untrained, and wretchedly paid teachers. The mass of the Irish people had then so few advantages, so little to encourage them to better things, that it is a wonder, not that they had vices, but that they had so few. The bulk of the people were not trusted with the franchise, they had no feeling of public duty or responsibility. They had seen their religion for years subjected to harsh and unjust laws. This made them cling to it with all the more devotion. Religious differences played their sad part, there was much bitterness on both sides, and, unfortunately, a great feeling of estrangement, too often of antagonism, between the two religions.

The Protestant peasantry of great parts of Ulster showed the qualities and the virtues which might be expected from their English and Scottish descent—energy, industry, perseverance and courage. Those of the other Provinces—the vast majority Roman

<sup>1</sup> ‘ Up to 1832 the children were taught in “ hedge ” schools, held in the open air, for want of the shelter of a roof. The teaching was probably rude and chaotic, but it used to be believed that the hedge schoolmasters were strong in classics, and it is certain that they sometimes sowed seed which, under the care of Irish Colleges in France, Spain, and Belgium, ripened into famous scholarship and eminent achievements ’ (Sir C. G. Duffy’s *Bird’s-eye View of Irish History*).

Catholic—were also largely descended from English settlers, with some Celtic intermixture ; while, indeed, parts of Ulster, Connaught and Munster were mainly of Celtic descent. The speaking of Irish cannot be taken as a certain test of descent, as the early settlers rapidly adopted the speech and garb and habits of the Irish. Thus, in parts of Meath, one of the counties of the Pale, Irish was very commonly spoken at the end of the last century. Nor can religion, or habits, or fluency, or characteristics, be relied on as any certain tests of race. The Tipperary peasants are largely descended from Cromwell's troopers, many of whom married and settled there, and in no part of Ireland are what are regarded as Irish characteristics more marked. Mrs. Oliphant<sup>1</sup> has referred to the strange and mysterious effect of residence for a few generations in the Irish climate, and to the 'sunshine which sometimes gets into English blood on the other side of the narrow seas' : 'The race of brilliant, witty, imprudent and reckless Irishmen, whom we have all been taught to admire, excuse, love and condemn—the Goldsmiths, the Sheridans, and many more that will occur to the reader—all belong to this mingled Anglo-Irish blood. They are more Irish, according to our present understanding of the word, than their compatriots of a purer race. How it is that the bog, and the mountain, the softer climate, the salt breath of the Atlantic, should have wrought this change is a mystery of ethnology which we are quite incompetent to solve; or whether it is mere external contact with an influence which the

<sup>1</sup> *Sheridan* ('English Men of Letters' series).

native gives forth, without himself being strongly affected by it, we cannot tell.'

The peasantry of the three southern provinces were and are taken as the type of the class in England. They were bright, quick and intelligent, genial, tactful and kindly, impulsive and sensitive, very shrewd, very courteous and plausible, with much 'blarney' and great powers of expression; always anxious to approve and to agree with visitors; fond of music, sport, dancing and fighting. Their faults were largely the product of their history, their virtues were their own. Their melodies reflected the strange mixture of temperament, grave and bright, tender and melancholy. Always quick and emotional, their moods rapidly changed; pathos and humour strangely mingled in their nature. In addition to their respect for religion, they maintained a high standard of domestic purity.

The Irish peasantry have suffered from the conception of them shown on the stage and in caricature, with large and hideous mouths, battered hats, and faces marking either villainy or imbecility. They were commonly taken to be idle, improvident, devil-may-care and reckless. But they were really like the French peasantry—often industrious and penurious, generally pleasant and light-hearted, and when they went to fair or wake they displayed qualities of their own by which they have been almost exclusively judged.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The novels of Carleton, Miss Edgeworth, Lady Morgan, Banim, Lever, Griffin, and Lover are most interesting from their accounts and stories of the Irish peasantry.

The Government of that day took but little note of these southern peasants. Their attention was directed exclusively to Parliament and its members, to Government and its difficulties.

Little glimpses of parts of the north and west of Ireland can be obtained from the short journal of the Duke of Rutland.<sup>1</sup> It begins: ‘July 3, 1787—I quitted Dublin in order to proceed on a tour round the whole kingdom of Ireland, which I had a long time meditated,’ and closes abruptly as follows: ‘September 29, 1787—Proceeded for Dublin, the prospect of a war with France in consequence of her interference with the affairs of Holland rendering my presence in Dublin absolutely necessary.’ The following passages are interesting: ‘We passed through a village (in Meath) in which there was a pattern, though it was Sunday, which answers to a wake in England. There we saw men, women, and even girls intoxicated by that pernicious liquor whisky, which influences the brain to madness, and at the same time leaves a perfect possession of the limbs to commit outrage with. It is to be hoped that this abominable poison will in time be disused. They speak but little English in this part, though so near the metropolis. . . . Newry is a town of great consequence. It has, however, been declining for six or seven years, as a good deal of smuggling has been introduced into the place. It seems admirably calculated for that purpose. . . . Lisburn is a seat of discon-

<sup>1</sup> The present Duke of Rutland, who republished his grandfather’s correspondence with Pitt, was kind enough to lend me the MS. of this journal.

tent and faction. A seditious society was here first formed to overset every establishment, calling themselves by a prostitution of the name “the Constitutional Society.” . . . Belfast is a great town, flourishing in everything : 500 houses have been built within a very short space of time—I think within a year. Their trade is immense. They go to the West Indies and to almost every quarter of the globe. A single ship paid this year 10,000*l.* King’s duties. The revenue collected from this port amounts annually to 120,000*l.* It holds about 16,000 inhabitants. It is full of Presbyterians, and was much connected with the Americans during the calamitous contest. It has always been very factious, but I was received with much kindness, and they gave me my freedom. This is the town where Volunteering has fixed its throne. . . . The situation of Derry is very striking. It is a town of great trade and superior smuggling. . . . We visited the wretched episcopal town of Killala, supported entirely by fishing, and in truth we can make no other remark but that the hospitality of the gentlemen at whose houses we visited made the most inhospitable looking country in the globe comfortable and pleasant.’

The Government dread of smuggling and the personal horror of whisky are very apparent.

The state of violence, riot and disorder in towns amongst all classes can hardly be imagined. The following, taken from ‘Ireland Sixty Years Ago,’<sup>1</sup> gives

<sup>1</sup> Published anonymously in 1847 by John Edward Walsh, afterwards P.C. and M.P. for Dublin University, Attorney-General and Master of the Rolls in Ireland.

some idea of the state of Dublin between 1780 and 1790 : ‘ Among the lower orders a feud and deadly hostility had grown up between the Liberty boys, or tailors and weavers of the Coombe, and the Ormond boys, which caused frequent conflicts ; and it is in the memory of many now living that the streets, and particularly the quays and bridges, were impassable in consequence of the battles of these parties. The weavers descending from the upper regions beyond Thomas Street down on their opponents below, they were opposed by the butchers, and a contest commenced on the quays which extended from Essex to Island Bridge. The shops were closed, all business suspended, the sober and peaceable compelled to keep their houses, while the war of stones and other missiles was carried on across the river, and the bridges were taken and retaken by the hostile parties. It will hardly be believed that for whole days the intercourse of the city was interrupted by these feuds. The few miserable watchmen, inefficient for any purpose of protection, looked on in terror, and thought themselves well acquitted of their duty if they escaped from stick and stone. A friend of ours has told us that he has gone down to Essex Bridge, when he has been informed that one of these battles was raging, and stood quietly on the battlements for a whole day, looking at the combat, in which above a thousand men were engaged. . . . The spirit of the times led men of the highest grade and respectability to join with the dregs of the market in these outrages, and the young aristocrat, who would have felt it a great degradation to

associate or even be seen with an honest merchant, however respectable, with a singular inconsistency made a boast of his intimate acquaintance with the lawless excesses of butchers and coal-porters. The students of Trinity College were particularly prone to join in these affrays, and generally united their forces to those of the Liberty boys. . . . The gownsmen were then a formidable body, and from a strong *esprit de corps* were ready to issue forth to avenge any insult offered to any of their party. Even the Fellows participated in this *esprit de corps*. . . . One of them, Dr. Wilder, was a man of very eccentric habits, and possessed little of that gravity and decorum that distinguish the present exemplary Fellows. He once met a young lady in one of the crossings where she could not pass him without walking in the mud. He stopped opposite her, and, gazing for a moment in her face, he laid his hands on each side and kissed her. He then nodded familiarly at the astonished and offended girl, and saying, "Take that, miss, for being so handsome," stepped out of the way and let her pass. He was going through the College courts one day when a bailiff was under discipline: he pretended to interfere for the man, and called out: "Gentlemen, for the love of God, don't be so cruel as to nail his ears to the pump!" This hint was immediately taken, and a hammer and nails were sent for and an ear was fastened with a tenpenny nail, and the wretched man remained for a considerable time, bleeding and shrieking with pain, before he was released.'

A tarring and feathering committee was actually established in Dublin, and unpopular citizens were often dragged from their beds, stripped naked, covered with pitch, rolled in feathers, and in that horrible condition turned into the streets. The Duke of Rutland, in one of his early letters to Pitt, says: ‘ Persons are daily marked out for the operation of tarring and feathering.’

There was then no police. In the day time the streets of Dublin were practically unprotected. The first appointment of a permanent night watch was in 1723, when parishes were directed to appoint ‘ honest men and good Protestants’ to be night watchers. The insecurity of this Dogberry system must have been keenly felt, and from time to time improvements were attempted, but with little success. The searches and arrests made in 1798 and 1803 were by soldiers in coloured clothes, under the directions of Majors Sirr and Swan, and not by police,<sup>1</sup> there being none suitable or available.

According to Sir Jonah Barrington, the common people of that time divided the gentry into three classes—half-mounted gentlemen, gentlemen every inch, and gentlemen to the backbone. The class called ‘ Bucks’ among the gentry of the period spent their lives in violence and eccentricity.

Some of the ‘ Bucks’ constituted the ‘ Hell Fire Club,’ and it is reported that they set fire to the room where they sat, and endured the flames with obstinacy till

<sup>1</sup> Fitzpatrick’s *Ireland before the Union*.

forced out of the house, and in derision, they boasted of a future state. Others met under the names of ‘Mohawk,’ ‘Hawkabite,’ and ‘Cherokee,’ and other tribes noted for ferocity.

The social life in great country houses must have been a little curious. Lord Mountjoy, when staying at Shane’s Castle (Lord O’Neill’s) in 1785, drew up the following resolutions :<sup>1</sup> ‘To promote regularity at Shane’s Castle at the meeting for the representation of “Cymbeline.”’ They were drawn up in a joke, but they give a glimpse of the habits of the time :

‘(1.) That no noise be made during the forenoon, for fear of wakening the company.

‘(2.) That there shall be no breakfast made after four o’clock in the afternoon, nor tea after one in the morning.

‘(3.) To inform any stranger who may come in to breakfast that we are not at dinner.

‘(4.) That no person be permitted to go out airing after breakfast till the moon gets up, for fear of being overturned in the dark.

‘(5.) That the respective grooms may put up their horses after four hours’ parading before the Hall door of the Castle.

‘(6.) That there shall be one complete hour between each meal.

<sup>1</sup> *Cornwallis Correspondence*, ii. 347. One gets a curious glimpse of the habits and ways of the time from the fact mentioned in the *Irish Quarterly Review*, iv. 822 : ‘The Duke of Rutland knighted Sir R. Maguire, a Trinity College student, for taking the place of an aeronaut whose weight prevented a balloon from rising.’

‘(7.) That all the company must assemble at dinner before the cloth is removed.

‘(8.) That supper may not be called for till five minutes after the last glass of claret.

‘(9.) That no gentleman be permitted to drink more than three bottles of Hock at or after supper.

‘(10.) That all M.P.’s shall assemble on post days in the coffee room at four o’clock to frank letters.’

Duelling was a very prevalent practice in Ireland from the Battle of the Boyne until the Union. It was much the fashion at and previous to Pitt’s accession to power, and the holders of the highest offices were prominent offenders. It was thought part of a polite education to have ‘smelt powder.’ Senators, judges, barristers, doctors, all fought their duels. It is told<sup>1</sup> that a young man going to the bar consulted the Vice-Provost of Trinity College as to his best course of study—whether he should begin with Fearne or Chitty. The advice he received was: ‘My young friend, practise four hours a day at Rigby’s [then, and until quite recently, a celebrated gunmaker in Dublin] pistol gallery, and it will advance you to the Woolsack faster than all the Farnes and Chittys in the library.’

So strong had the habit grown, that duelling clubs were established in many places. Counties became distinguished for particular weapons. Tipperary, Sligo, and Roscommon for the pistol—‘the leaden branch of the pastime’—Galway for the sword, Mayo for both. Nearly all the great public men at that time had fought, many of them several duels. Lord Clare, the Chan-

<sup>1</sup> *Ireland Sixty Years Ago*, p. 17.

cellor, Lord Clonmel, the Chief Justice, Curran, the Master of the Rolls, Lord Norbury, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, Baron Metge, Corry, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Grattan, Hely-Hutchinson, Secretary of State and Provost of Trinity College, Sir Hardinge Giffard, Chief Justice of Ceylon, and numerous other prominent men, all fought duels. Indeed, Toler, Lord Norbury, fought so many that it was said he *shot up* into preferment.<sup>1</sup> These bad habits cannot be deprecated as mere Irish outbursts of indiscretion. It must not be forgotten that Pitt himself fought a duel with Tierney and Fox with Adam. Abduction<sup>2</sup> of heiresses was then a frequent practice. These offences were deliberately planned and carried out, and although *forcible* abduction was made a capital offence in the reign of Queen Anne, it continued for many years after. The girl was always placed before the man on the horse—used on these occasions—as it was the common belief that the man could not then be punished, the woman having abducted him! An abduction club was actually formed in the south of Ireland, the members of which were bound to assist each other in carrying off heiresses. No class was exempt from the operations of this band, and the daughters of rich farmers as well as of the gentry were subject to their enterprise. Some-

<sup>1</sup> ‘Two hundred and twenty-seven memorable and official duels have actually been fought during my time’ (Sir Jonah Barrington, *Sketches of His Own Time*, ii. 5).

<sup>2</sup> Froude appears to put forward the strange theory that abductions were an organised form of guerilla warfare carried on by Catholics against Protestants, with the sanction of the Church, for the purpose of avenging confiscations and getting converts. Mr. Lecky has entirely refuted the idea, which has no foundation.

times abduction was a method of courtship, and sometimes it was resorted to with the assent of the young lady—to overcome parents' objections. Some stern and necessary prosecutions<sup>1</sup> checked, and ultimately put down, this practice of criminal and forcible abductions, which was a strange sign of the lawlessness of those times.

Drinking habits were unfortunately then terribly prevalent. Sir W. Petty,<sup>2</sup> writing in 1682, when Dublin contained only 6,025 houses, states that 1,200 were public-houses. In 1798 every third house in Thomas Street was a public-house. Claret was then amongst

<sup>1</sup> Scott, the Attorney-General (afterwards Lord Clonmel) deserves the principal credit for this. See *Ireland Sixty Years Ago* and Fitzpatrick's *Ireland before the Union*. Mr. Fitzpatrick devotes much of this book to Lord Clonmel, and publishes many interesting extracts and maxims from his private Diary, e.g.: 'Answer all unpleasant questions by asking another question, and never before you can begin with a smile. Make yourself pleasing by flattering all. Make every man your dupe by flattery. Avoid intimacies. Suffer no man to come so near you that you cannot call him "Mr." with propriety. Satan had found no footing in Paradise if he had not gained over Eve to his party; for ever secure some she-thing to your interest, young or old, high or low, mistress or maid. A man who would establish a great character with the world must be a constant actor. Lord Chatham, Cromwell, and Provost Hutchinson were great actors. You should never take any familiarity with a Bishop, especially in company. They are all proud and jealous of their superiority and powers, and of their sacred functions. A race for the seals [Chancellorship] can be won but by superlative enthusiasm, watchfulness, temperance, diligence, and acting. In political life take every possible advantage of persons in actual power. People as they advance in years should retire from places of exhibition and entertainment. I have known several old men lose their lives by being put out of their way or out of their usual habits.' The Chief Justice's advice to age cannot be compared with Swift's comical and caustic 'Things to remember when I get old.'

<sup>2</sup> *Ireland Sixty Years Ago*, p. 55. Habits of excessive drinking were not at all confined to Ireland. When the Goldsmiths' Company entertained Pitt in their noble hall on May 13, 1784, a party of fifty drank 193 bottles of wine—probably mostly Port!

the upper classes the great consumption. Port was recommended in its place, ‘because it would not permit so long a sitting—a great advantage to wise men in saving a great deal of their precious time.’ The rule of drinking was that no man should leave the company till he was unable to *stand*, and then he might go, if he could *walk*. The counsels from age to youth were: ‘Make your head while you are young,’ and ‘No man who drank ever died, but many died learning to drink.’

The habits to ensure a steady and *loyal* drinking were grotesque. If a guest left the room, pieces of paper were dropped into his glass, equal to the number of rounds the bottle had gone during his absence, and on his return he was obliged to swallow a glass for each, under the penalty of as many glasses of salt and water. Often the bottles had round bottoms; stopping the bottle was therefore impossible, and everyone was obliged to fill his glass at once, and pass the bottle to his neighbour, in peril of upsetting the contents. Often the stems were knocked off the glasses, so that they must be emptied as fast as they were filled, as they could not stand. The guests sometimes, when they sat down, had to take off their shoes, which were taken out of the room, and emptied bottles were broken outside the door, so that no one could leave till the party ended. In a letter of John Beresford to Allen (‘Beresford Correspondence,’ i. 156) of January 26, 1781, describing the Lord-Lieutenant and Chief Secretary, he says: ‘Lord Carlisle is thought stiff and distant. Eden, they say, does not drink enough’—showing one of the standards then applied to that worrying office. But if too much

was drunk, the hospitality was generous and genuine, and the Attorney-General Scott (ib. 161), speaking of the limits of his own room, refers with envy to the large accommodation at Curraghmore, where Lord Tyrone was able to have 'not less than three score and ten at table every day.'

Secret societies<sup>1</sup> proved a most painful and dangerous element in Ireland during the last half of the eighteenth century, and, indeed, long before and since, and were in full vitality when Pitt took the office of Prime Minister. The Whiteboys first appeared in 1761 in Munster, and committed great outrages, but were agrarian rather than political. In Ulster, about the same time, attention was drawn to the 'Hearts of Oak' and 'Hearts of Steel,' whose objects were also connected principally with land troubles. In 1785 the 'Right Boys,' led by an imaginary 'Captain Right,' appeared, and were really a revival of the 'Whiteboys,' and committed grievous outrages on tithe proctors, agents, middlemen, and others. In the north a society called 'Peep-o'-Day Boys,' or 'Protestant Boys,' or 'Wreckers,' had started up and directed their efforts against the Roman Catholics, who combined again into a new society called 'Defenders.' The secret societies have always been a source of trouble and anxiety to every Irish Government for many generations, and the Irish Executive appointed by Pitt had to face this difficulty in full development.

<sup>1</sup> A useful short sketch of these societies may be found in a few pages of Joyce's *Concise History of Ireland*, but all should read the full and interesting narrative in Mr. Lecky's history. *The Local Disturbances of Ireland*, by G. C. Lewis, is also instructive.

At this time tithes were a great source of trouble. All had to pay, no matter what their religion, whether they belonged to the Established Church or were Roman Catholics or Dissenters. The grievance was aggravated by the tithe proctors, or tithe farmers, who collected tithes for absentee clergymen. These men received generally a fixed proportion, a third or a fourth, to pay for the collection, and it was said that they extorted more than the law sanctioned. The bitterness of feeling was increased because the rich grazing farmers were exempt, which, of course, discouraged tillage, and tended, on all sides, to throw the country into grass land. This agrarian condition, combined with stagnation of trade, the result of the long continued commercial restrictions, produced a situation in Ireland which called for the wisdom of the wisest and the strength of the strongest.

Pitt brought to the task a complete and enlightened love of justice, and a determination to do what he thought right. No statesman can ever do more.

When the Duke of Rutland, as Lord-Lieutenant, went to Dublin, he rapidly applied himself to understand the position. He and Orde were Englishmen having no previous connection with Ireland, and he had necessarily to avail himself of the brains and experience of the Irishmen he found in office in Dublin. Two of them, John Fitzgibbon and John Beresford, were men of great ability, great power and great courage, and all through his administration he and Orde relied immensely on them. They wielded great authority and influence for many years in Ireland, and

in their several ways played great parts in the history of their country.

John Beresford<sup>1</sup> was a man of powerful mind and much resource and self-reliance, and for more than a quarter of a century played a great part in the counsels of Irish administration. He probably could have been Speaker in 1771 had he been willing to resign his seat on the Revenue Board ; he was once sounded as to his feelings about being Chief Secretary ; and actually refused the Irish Chancellorship of the Exchequer when Foster vacated that office to become Speaker. His office at the Revenue Board and his thorough acquaintance with the fiscal relations of England and Ireland made his counsel and aid most essential in the discussion of the commercial resolutions. At Pitt's request he went in advance of Foster to London in order that he might be able to assist and advise during the discussions in the Cabinet and in the House of Commons. His correspondence with Orde during his sojourn there shows how close an observer he was of the whole position, and how truly he valued Pitt, and how little he valued the rest of the Cabinet. Rose

<sup>1</sup> John Beresford, born March 14, 1738, second son of Marcus, Earl of Tyrone, and his wife the Baroness le Poer, the heiress of a long line of barons descending from Roger le Poer, who accompanied Strongbow to Ireland ; called to the Bar 1760, but never practised ; in 1761 returned M.P. for Waterford, which he continued to represent for forty-four years ; in 1770 appointed by Lord Townshend Commissioner of Revenue ; in 1780 became First Commissioner ; in 1768 sworn a member of the Privy Council in Ireland ; in 1786 sworn a member of that in England ; married, first, Henrietta Constantine de Liguardes, granddaughter of the Count de Liguardes ; second, Barbara, daughter of Sir W. Montgomery, sister to the Marchioness Townshend and Lady Mountjoy. The three sisters sat to Sir Joshua Reynolds in his picture of 'The Three Graces Adorning the Temple of Hymen,' now in the National Gallery.

thus describes him in a letter<sup>1</sup> to Orde, August 7, 1785: ‘He is one of the pleasantest men in business I have ever met with; he has one point about him of still higher consequence, which is that he ensures the possession of the confidence of the person with whom he is transacting matters.’ Lord Clonmel<sup>2</sup> in his private Diary refers to the advantages which Beresford enjoyed from ‘the conciliatory awkward innocence of his face;’ and there can be no doubt that he got on well in life and made many warm friends amongst those with whom he was brought in contact. He was from time to time most intimate with the different Viceroys and Chief Secretaries with whom he served. He carried on the closest, almost daily, correspondence for years with Eden—afterwards Lord Auckland—and the ‘Beresford Correspondence’ is full of the letters of the latter. His summary dismissal by Lord Fitzwilliam, and the events consequent thereon, are well known, and will be referred to more in detail in a subsequent chapter.

Beresford’s letters to Orde are full of interest. They show how closely he was mixed up with Pitt’s life during his sojourn in London, there being frequent statements of hours spent with him: many of his letters were practically dictated by Pitt, and he often breakfasted and dined with him. The letters are written freely, *currente calamo*, and contain views and impressions off-hand. Beresford was behind the scenes in London, was very frequently with Pitt, and would

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

<sup>2</sup> *Fitzpatrick’s Ireland before the Union.*

appear to have been summoned to be present at some parts of several Cabinets.

Beresford did a great deal to beautify and improve Dublin, and to make it the handsome city that it is. To him is mainly due the erection of the Custom House—a noble building—and his name is commemorated in the adjacent Beresford Place. To him Dublin also owes the wideness of many of its important streets, and the improving of their approaches, and at Eden's own request he called Eden Quay after him.

The Duke of Rutland himself, from the first moment that he landed in Ireland, applied himself to master the position and needs of Ireland. His letter on June 16, 1784, to Pitt,<sup>1</sup> shows a vigorous grasp of the difficulties to be met :

[*Private*]

Dublin Castle : June 16, 1784.

My dear Pitt,—

Whatever advantages Great Britain may be enabled and disposed to grant, let them be declared to be *conclusive*. I must press this idea on your mind as a point in any arrangement *indispensable*, for as long as anything indefinite remains for expectation to feed upon this country will never be at peace.

The question of reform, should it be carried in England, would tend greatly to increase our difficulties, and I do not see how it will be evaded. In England it is a delicate question, but in this country it is difficult and dangerous in the last degree. The views of the Catholics render it extremely hazardous, and though Lord Charlemont and Mr. Flood seem to exclude them from their ideas of reform, yet in some late meetings, and in one particularly held in this city, the point entirely ran on their admission to vote, which was carried with a single negative.

Your proposition of a certain proportionable addition of

<sup>1</sup> *Rutland Correspondence.*

county members would be the least exceptionable, and might not perhaps materially interfere with the *system of Parliament* in this country, which, though it must be confessed it does not bear the smallest *resemblance to representation*, I do not see how quiet and good government could exist under any more popular mode.

I should say that without a *union* Ireland will not be connected with Great Britain in twenty years longer.

Believe me to be, &c.

RUTLAND.

The mode of communication between the Government in London and the Irish Administration was by messenger. The letters show that the messengers sometimes took four or even five days in their journey, and Orde alludes to one being forty hours at sea.<sup>1</sup> It may have been a check on the messengers, but almost all the letters state the very hour and minute at which they were written. Rutland was thoroughly loyal to his chief and colleagues, straight and reliable. After the defeat of the resolutions in the Irish House of Commons, he put away all cowardly ideas of resignation, and wrote to Pitt:<sup>2</sup> 'No alteration shall take place in my determination. I will never think of quitting my station while I can render an iota of strength to your Government, or to the great cause in which we are embarked.'

He was a sincere friend of Orde, for whom he had

<sup>1</sup> A favourable passage would take about twelve hours. Lord Lothian writes to the Duke of Rutland in 1786: 'I landed after a passage of twenty-four hours, for which I paid eighteen guineas' (*Hist. MSS. Com.*, *Rutland Correspondence*, iii. 383).

<sup>2</sup> *Rutland Correspondence*.

great respect. When, after the defeat in the House of Commons, representations were made to Pitt against Orde (a scapegoat is sometimes desired), he communicated with the Viceroy, and the Duke of Rutland sent such a reply<sup>1</sup> that Pitt at once laid aside the subject. He said,<sup>2</sup> ‘It is impossible for me to consent to his being made a sacrifice to idle prejudice or ill-founded clamour.’

The Duke travelled much in Ireland, and visited at Curraghmore and other places. His journal has already been referred to. He died after a very short illness on October 23, 1787, and was very widely regretted by all classes with whom he had come in contact in Ireland.

The Duke of Rutland was a great lover of art, and kept up a close and intimate correspondence with Sir Joshua Reynolds, through whom he purchased some celebrated pictures. He pressed the great painter on several occasions to visit him in Ireland, but Reynolds seemed to think he was safer in London. Pulteney, who was a kind of confidential political correspondent of the Duke, and who sat for one of his seats, wrote<sup>3</sup> in May 1784: ‘I saw Sir Joshua Reynolds a week ago, and he says he never was in so much suspense in his life as whether he will visit on your Grace this summer. I endeavoured to assure him how quiet he would find Ireland, in spite of any accounts in the papers, and he said at last he thought he would venture over.’

Reynolds himself in the following September writes

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com., Rutland Correspondence*, iii. 98.   <sup>2</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com., Rutland Correspondence*, iii. 98.   <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* iii. 139

to the Duke from Belvoir : ‘ I should be glad to proceed to Ireland, but I heard yesterday from Mrs. Siddons such a sad account of the Liberty Boys, that I have hardly courage to venture ; she came away in a terrible fright, and has not yet recovered herself.’

In the same letter he refers to his recent appointment : ‘ The place which I have the honour of holding of the King’s principal portrait painter is a place of not so much profit and of near equal dignity with his Majesty’s rat-catcher. The salary is 38*l.* per annum, and for every whole length I am to be paid 50*l.*, instead of 200*l.*, which I have from everybody else. Your Grace sees that this new honour is not likely to elate me very much. I need not make any resolution to behave with the same familiarity as I used to with my old acquaintance.’

It would appear from a subsequent letter that the reduction from 200*l.* to 50*l.* was an innovation, possibly due to the thrifty views of the King and the indifference to art shown by Pitt, one of his weakest points.

Writing<sup>1</sup> the following year, Reynolds said he feared Mr. Pitt had not much attraction to the arts, and asked for the Duke’s influence to get him the post of Secretary to the Order of the Bath as a kind of compensation for the reduction. He added, as an inducement to the Viceroy, ‘ though, as I said before, the difficulties of my visiting Ireland are very great, yet in this case, if your Grace can procure me this honourable place, I should think it an indispensable duty to make my personal appearance to return my thanks with the Order about

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com., Rutland Correspondence*, iii. 229.

my neck, though not on my shoulder.' Some of these silly fears about visiting Ireland still exist, though there are no people in the world more courteous and polite to visitors and tourists than the Irish. They may sometimes have little domestic arguments, but they never think of troubling strangers with them.

The Duke of Rutland was a grand seigneur. His correspondence contains many letters from Kendall about procuring the choicest wines and the rarest vintages, and also about getting his cooks improved on the Continent. The following from one of Kendall's letters<sup>1</sup> shows his employment : 'I wish it had been convenient to send your cook Jones two months sooner ; most of our capital houses at Versailles and Paris are broken up for the summer. Nevertheless, he employs his time very well in the Duke of Orleans' kitchen, and in that of the Archbishop of Narbonne. . . . I am glad the coffee cup pleased you, but am surprised that the chocolate cup has not been forwarded. It was delivered to Lord Chesterfield with the instructions to remit it to Mr. Sneyd, of the Secretary of State office.' He mentions in a subsequent letter that he had obtained a promise that the Duke's cook, who was then 'fixed' in the Duke of Orleans' kitchen, should be present at any extraordinary effort of skill in any other kitchen !

The opinion of his contemporaries rated the Duke of Rutland very high, and there can be but little doubt that if his life had not so prematurely ended he would have attained a still more commanding influence in public life.

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com., Rutland Correspondence*, iii. 385.





G. Romney, pinx.

W. Hollar & Son, sculps.

Right Hon. Thomas Orde.

## CHAPTER III

### ORDE

Orde's birth—Family—Delicacy—His letters—Importance of just commercial relations between England and Ireland—Pitt did not hurry—His letter to Orde on general Irish position—Further letter—Orde to Pitt—Pitt to Orde on importance of establishing fixed principles—Just commercial arrangement—Reform—Resolution to create no Dukes—Pitt lays down fundamental principles of policy towards Ireland—Consulting the judges—Effort to call a Congress—Orde on the Congress—Pitt anxious to find out opinions as to reforms—Congress—Proceedings against Conveners—Pitt to Rutland and Orde—Anxious for same duties as in Great Britain on foreign articles—Resolutions introduced—Orde made concessions—Pitt took quick exception—Rose—His views—Pitt carrying resolutions through Westminster—Orde's pocket-book about M.P.'s—Paper as to price of M.P.'s—Orde's frequent letters—Very adroit—Orde's health not good—Offered to resign—Pitt pressed him to stay on—Arthur Wellesley.

THE Right Honourable Thomas Orde,<sup>1</sup> the first Chief Secretary under Pitt, was a member of an old Northumbrian family, whose brother was a distinguished naval officer, a comrade of Nelson.

He was an able, experienced, and most loyal and industrious public servant, who won the confidence of

<sup>1</sup> The Right Hon. Thomas Orde, born 1748 ; M.P. for Aylesbury 1780, for Harwich 1784, again for Harwich 1790; appointed, 1782, Secretary to the Treasury; 1784, Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant; married, 1778, Anne Powlett, daughter of Charles, last Duke of Bolton, and took the name of Orde-Powlett 1794, when, on the death of her father, his wife inherited the Bolton estates; created, 1797, Baron Bolton; he was also a Privy Councillor, and later Lord-Lieutenant of Hampshire; died 1807. The present Lord Bolton is his great-grandson.

Pitt and the esteem and friendship of the Duke of Rutland. Although only thirty-six when appointed to Ireland, almost all through his official life there he was not in good health, and suffered from his eyes and general delicacy. He had to go several times to Bath and to Spa, both then great health resorts, but he stuck steadily to his work as long as he could. He was a copious letter-writer and took great care of his correspondence. He kept three large letter-books—one with copies of some of his own more important letters, another with copies of some of those of leading public men, and another of correspondence about places, offices and patronage.

At once on going to Ireland he was returned by Government influence for the borough of Rathcormick, and had<sup>1</sup> to take immediate charge of the conduct of official business in the Irish House of Commons, then enriched by the presence of many great men and splendid orators. He appears not to have excited any hostile or bitter feelings, and to have enjoyed consideration and respect. His correspondence suggests that he was able, prudent, circumspect and cautious; a man who knew how to keep his own counsel. The notes of his speech in the House of Commons on the commercial resolutions are very full, and suggest that his speech was most conciliatory, able, well reasoned and clear.

<sup>1</sup> ‘Mr. Orde took his seat Saturday, and spoke well. I cannot adequately express his unwearied exertions and prudent management’ (*Hist. MSS. Com., Rutland Correspondence*, iii. 80). ‘In Parliament I have always been informed he is patient, manly, and dignified, not afraid to combat even the most formidable opponents’ (Duke of Rutland to Pitt, November 5, 1785, *Pretyman MSS.*).

The establishment of sound, liberal and just commercial relations between Great Britain and Ireland was an object of the last importance to Ireland. Unless some reasonable and fair plan was adopted, in a spirit of mutual concession, there was nothing for it but to go on in some uncertain, undefined way, with possibly the chances of a war of tariffs, and the risk of protection being adopted by one country against the other.

Pitt did not at all rush into his attempted settlement of the commercial arrangements between the two countries. He allowed months to pass before he formulated any plan, and during this interval he was applying himself to master the general situation and to allow the Viceroy and Chief Secretary to do so also.

The following letters<sup>1</sup> of Pitt to Orde, written not many months after his acceptance of office, are interesting, and show how rapidly he was getting familiar with the Irish political atmosphere :

[*Private*]

Putney Heath : Friday Night, August 20, 1784.

My dear Sir,—I take the first moment after the close of the session to thank you for the satisfaction of your letters, and to begin my part of the correspondence which on every account I shall be obliged to you for making as frequent as your time will permit. I am happy to collect from your accounts that you do not upon the whole entertain a more unfavourable opinion of the aspect of affairs. I confess I have been very anxious from the unlucky affray which seemed capable of turning again the tide just as it was beginning to be rather more in our favour. I hope, as we have heard nothing farther, the consequences have not been very material. Lord Harrington's letter, which is published, ought to conciliate. I still feel, however, that if

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

there remains any ill humour on the subject, it would be better handsomely to get rid of the persons concerned than to let Government be at all mixed in the business.

What you mention of the decay of the Volunteers is one of the best circumstances. I shall be very glad to have an account as well as it can be made out of their numbers on the whole, and of the most active persons, and the most considerable, either in ability or property, who take part with them in the different parts of the country. If *any way* can be found to detach from the cause any considerable number, after the example of the Carrickfergus corps, it would be a great object. I should think, perhaps, with management, such a thing might be practicable, but *that* you can judge of much better. I agree quite with you that nothing more could be done in the present moment with regard to the Carrickfergus corps than commanding and encouraging their loyalty. A direct assistance from Government, either of arms or money, might in many respects be hazardous. The business of the county meeting I am sure you will have attended is an object of great delicacy. It seems to me necessary on the one hand to cherish the spirit of any friends of Government who will stand forth, and on the other hand not to give the friends to disorder any advantage by encouraging anything that can be construed into an attack on the legal rights of petitioning. Wherever the Sheriffs or any leading men have found that just medium, and taken both a spirited and temperate line (which, I hope, is the case in some instances), undoubtedly we shall all feel that they cannot be enough distinguished by the favour of Government. At the same time that you furnish an account of the Volunteers I shall be obliged to you if you will also state what the force is of our military, and how stationed with a view to the most important districts; I mention this rather from an anxiety to be possessed of the important facts than from allowing myself to fear that any event is likely to bring such considerations into immediate question.

The madness of the Bishop of Derry,<sup>1</sup> though certainly not innocent, has not yet, I should think, reached to legal guilt of

<sup>1</sup> Lord Bristol.

such magnitude as to admit of any vigorous and decisive proceedings. I am clear, as I am persuaded you are, that no blow should be menaced till it can be struck. I hope you will be as successful as you expect in interesting the oracles of modern times—the newspapers—in your favour. Though not the most glorious, they are, I am sure, both here and in Ireland, the most effectual, and perhaps both the cheapest and the most harmless engines that Government in such circumstances can employ. You will receive from Lord Sydney a copy of the Speech from the Throne. The last paragraph, you will perceive, was inserted with a view to that we talked of, and, I hope, will meet your ideas. I wait impatiently, though with no wonder at the delay when so much is to be done, for the heads of the Commercial Investigation which you have promised me. I must trouble you now with three applications which have been made to me, on which, as on everything which relates to Ireland, I have given no answer till I can hear the Duke of Rutland's sentiments. Lord Mulgrave, understanding that persons near him in the peerage are to be earls, is anxious to obtain that step. If it is not inconvenient, his conduct has been so honourable and handsome that I should rejoice in forwarding his wishes. If there is any real objection I only wish to be able to state to him what it is. I find, too, from him that Mr. Dillon (I believe his relation), who, though in present embarrassment, is the owner of an immense property, and is already a privy councillor, wishes to be made a baron. He professes great zeal, and thinks his influence may be of considerable use. I have no direct application from Mr. Dillon. I wish to know how far you think him of consequence, that I may either damp the idea, or to encourage it so far as to let him apply to the Duke of Rutland upon it. The last thing relates to Lord Arden (Mr. Percival that was), who has now Irish property which he means to visit, and wishes to be an Irish privy councillor. I have a great regard for him, and wish it for his sake if it is unexceptionable ; not otherwise.

I am obliged to you for the account of Lord Townshend, and shall be glad if you can find an opportunity of returning expressions of regard, though I do not see my way at present to

go much further. If it could be practicable, I should be very glad of it. I am afraid I cannot yet bind myself to any precise time for General Luttrell, though I shall be really desirous to gratify him as soon as possible.

With regard to the fisheries, on that subject as well as any other relating to commerce, nothing will certainly be done in this country without considering how Ireland, as a part of the Empire, will be affected by it.

I will not fatigue you more at this time, but shall be much obliged to you for every communication you can send me, and will trouble you with everything from hence that seems material to be known.

Our session has concluded most triumphantly, and nothing but untoward events can give Opposition a chance to make a better figure the next.

Pray make my most affectionate compliments to the Duke, and believe me, with great truth and esteem, my dear sir,

Most sincerely yours,

W. Pitt.

[*Private*]

Putney Heath: Thursday Night, August 25, 1784.

My dear Sir,—I am much obliged to you for the interesting letters which I received by the last messenger from Dublin. I impatiently wait for the result of your further investigation.

In the present stage of what you inform me of, nothing more occurs to me than earnestly to recommend to you not to let anything you discover to be made public, and it is fully certain that you know the whole extent of the plans that have been in agitation, and as far as possible all the persons any way concerned in them.

I am aware that an early publication of the intrigues of France (if the facts should answer your expectation) would strike an immediate damp on the operations of the discontented, and perhaps diminish greatly the difficulties of the present moment. But unless you are sure that your discoveries have gone to the root, the evil will be suspended, but not cured. In the country, too, the blame will be very great, and the effect perhaps on the state of our credit serious, if news should tran-

spire of France taking a part in Ireland, and if the same moment does not also publish that her designs are known to the inmost, and defeated. It would also be a matter of serious and delicate consideration, what language ought to be held to the Court of France if the Court should appear to be at all involved in the business, or even if the charge is traced home to any French subjects. Interference of this sort, the moment we have proof of it cannot be tolerated, but the manner of taking notice of it cannot be too much considered.

I should therefore allow these reasons to be stated to the Duke of Rutland, as making me anxious, if it be possible, that before any particulars are made known in Ireland an exact account should be transmitted hither, that we may have time, before any public *éclat*, to take in concert whatever measure may be necessary. I trust there is little reason to fear anything from the personal attacks which these villains had proposed to themselves, though it increases at the same time not a little my anxiety for constant information. You will have the goodness to give my affectionate compliments to the Duke, and show him what I have written. Adieu.

Yours faithfully and sincerely,

W. Pitt.

On the same August 25, 1784, Orde wrote a long letter<sup>1</sup> to Pitt, going into much detail on the matters then occupying his attention. He mentioned how necessary it was to employ the military to execute 'the sentences of the law,' and the exertions then made to provoke them, or at all events to represent them as employed solely to enforce 'the most oppressive and tyrannical measures'; that party tumults and disorders were used to engage the attention of the public while serious plans are devising 'for the destruction of every remnant of law and subordination'; that there could hardly be a doubt that the intention was, not a mere

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

non-importation agreement or a parliamentary reform, or even a dissolution of Parliament, but an ‘entire dissolution of the subsisting connection with Great Britain’; that it was his opinion that they would seek to effect their purposes by the Catholics; and he adds: ‘It is stated that an open attempt is absolutely to be made immediately to throw off all connection with Great Britain, and that of course this is to be supported by foreign assistance.’ He mentioned that Father O’Leary’s terms were 100*l.* per annum, and that he was desired to ‘open himself to whoever sends for him’; that it was said that O’Leary had been ‘connected with Mr. Fox in the Westminster business,’ yet, he added: ‘I believe we could have him securely for money and good words. I pray you not to neglect him.’

At the close of his letter he uses worthy and statesmanlike language: ‘I shall repeat what I have always said—everything tends to strengthen the sentiment: act towards Ireland with the utmost liberality consistent with your own safety; it must in the long run be the wisest policy. But you are nevertheless not to forget that you must not hope to please everybody, and especially in this country. You will have regard only to what in reason *ought to satisfy* Ireland, and not to what will satisfy her. Let her be sure of the firm and fixed decision, and she will then, and not till then, begin to consider to which of her great means, and indeed blessings, she should best turn for enjoyment.’ Subsequent holders of Orde’s office might sometimes have used language not unlike some of his sentences and experienced some of his difficulties. In a subse-

quent letter of September 8, 1784,<sup>1</sup> Orde said to Pitt: ‘There is a settled resolution to attempt a perfect separation between the two countries.’ Pitt, in the following letter to Orde,<sup>2</sup> gives with great fulness his views on several important matters.

Brightelmstone : Sunday, Sept. 19, 1784.

My dear Sir,—Before I left town yesterday I received by the post your letter, dated the 12th. I hope the wind will not long retard a particular account of such discoveries as you have been enabled to make. On so delicate and important a subject I have infinite satisfaction that both the vigilance and discretion with which you pursue it may be fully relied upon. You will, I am sure, see the reasons which have induced me to wish that no measures may be taken in consequence of your information that may commit Government to any extent without previous concert here. . . . As far as I can now judge, we need not meet until the end of January, and I think, if I recollect right, you seemed to think of about the same period. The points that now present themselves for discussion are not without delicacy and difficulty; but what appears to me more delicate and difficult than the arrangement of any one or all the specific points that can be stated, is to endeavour to establish some fixed principles which may from time to time be applied to new circumstances as they arise in the relative situations of the two countries. It is not enough if we settle what shall be the modification of the Navigation Act, or what shall be the proportion of duties on certain commodities. We must, in order to make a permanent and tranquil system, find some line according to which the Parliaments of the two countries may exercise the rights of legislation, without clashing with each other on the one hand, or, on the other, being encumbered by the necessity of actual and positive concert on every point of common concern. We experienced the difficulty of the latter part of this alternative in the end of last session, in the Smuggling Act. . . . Another general consideration, and of great leading importance, will be

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

with regard to the increase of revenue collected in Ireland, which must in progress of time be the result of any extensive communication of fresh commercial advantages which this country may make to Ireland. And, as part of both the former considerations, it will be to be settled how far Great Britain should have the power, in case of any alterations of port duties in this country, to compel Ireland to keep pace with them in similar alterations relative to the same objects in this country. It is certainly on general principles desirable (*though with some reservations arising from the actual circumstances*) that the system of commerce should be so arranged as to extend the aggregate wealth of Great Britain and Ireland to its utmost limit, without partiality or preference to one part of the Empire or the other. But for this purpose two things seem fundamentally requisite. One, that Ireland, which will thus gain upon England in relative strength and riches, should proportionately relieve her of the burden which she now sustains exclusively. The other, that this increase of strength and riches in Ireland may really prove either a positive addition to that of the Empire at large, or at least a transfer only from one member of it to the other, and may not in the end be *so much taken from ourselves and given to a separate country*. The security of this last point must depend upon the cordiality and friendship which ought to be the effect of a liberal system, and perhaps also on endeavouring so to settle the arrangement as that what is given to Ireland may rather augment their wealth and navigation, and the seeds of resources of power to the empire at large, than put them in possession of any actual force capable of being at any time independently exerted under their separate direction. One distinct object, and indeed the principal one in this view of the matter, is that of naval strength. It is of the utmost importance to have that well considered in any settlement to be made. By what you say on that subject, Ireland has not yet aspired to a separate navy of her own I do not know with any precision what advantages she has to enable her to attempt it, but it is a matter not unlikely to be started in the course of the discussion. The operation, indeed, of many of these speculations is remote. It may be long before the industry and the capital of Ireland

are sufficient to bring forward the application of them to practice. But in such a question as this we must look to remote as well as to immediate consequences; and it is always possible that, in so great a change as that made in the situation of Ireland by what has been done, and perhaps may yet remain to be done, that the effects may be more rapid than any calculations can now foresee. It would, however, be running beyond the mark to enter minutely into this consideration till it is certain what remains that can be given and what must be withheld: that must be the result of full investigation on all the points that are suggested. After all, the great question remains: *What is it that in truth will give satisfaction and restore permanent tranquility to Ireland?* Much has been given already, and the effect has been very little in proportion. It will be idle to make concessions without having good ground to think that they will attain their object. I believe what you have stated to be perfectly just—that the internal poverty and distress of the country is the radical cause of all the discontent that prevails. Of that the cure must be gradual and probably slow. The utmost present effect, then, of any measures we can take will be to remove or diminish the pretexts of discontent, and to eradicate the cause of it must be the work of time; or at most, if we remove some things that are perhaps not barely pretexts but real additional causes of discontent, *that one great cause* will still remain. In such a situation we can only hope to prevent in some degree the most mischievous effects of what we cannot at once remove, and must trust to the progressive operation of a prudent system to extinguish at length the seeds of this disorder. In the meantime, things have seemed to threaten a premature crisis, and if the tide goes on against us we shall either have an opportunity to introduce the only salutary system, or time will not be allowed for its effect to operate. It is therefore of the utmost importance to take out of the hands of the disaffected whatever may enable them in these circumstances to push things to an extremity. In this respect the question of parliamentary reform, considering it only as a matter of present expediency, is of infinite importance. In the manner in which it has lately been pushed in Ireland I have no difficulty in say-

ing it must be vigorously resisted. There is no pretence for arguing that the conduct of the Parliament of Ireland justifies the people in recurring to original rights and considering the present Constitution as dissolved. The language of the Belfast petition seemed to me to convey this construction, and in this view I wrote them an answer to their application to me to present it, a copy of which I enclose for your information. But it is totally another question whether a sober and rational reform, peaceably proposed and calmly considered, ought to be resisted. I am aware of the arguments against giving way in any degree. It is feared that we shall disgust those who are now the chief support of Government, by showing a disposition to admit what many of them are personally interested in opposing; that a reform from which the Catholics are excluded (which beyond a doubt they must be) will give them fresh ground for dissatisfaction; and that perhaps a reform in the representation would render Parliament too subservient to the prejudices or opinions of the Irish nation to acquiesce in an English Government. These three objections are the principal that have reached me. I have weighed them again and again, and in the critical situation of our interests in Ireland I feel that they are material. But I doubt, with regard to the first, whether the advantage of the support we endeavour to keep is not counterbalanced by the opposition we create; and further, I do not despair that an adequate plan of reform might be so far reconciled to private interest as to leave individuals no great cause of complaint or disgust, especially when we consider how much still remains to make them court the protection of Government, and how much they would find their own security against greater danger in any measure which made that Government more generally popular.

As to the effect on the Catholics: I do not know that a reform would make them feel their situation the more galling, unless it proceeds on the idea of universal suffrage being essential to liberty. I trust that the bulk of reformers look to some principle far short of that, and totally distinct from it. I conceive (too) that the incentive to the leaders among the Catholics is not any theoretical principle of government, much less of liberty,

but the hope of one way or other regaining property and power. This motive equally operates in the present state of Parliament, and would continue to influence them if the object of reform could be put totally out of the question. They may indeed join at present in the cry of reform, in hopes that it may be made conducive to their real object; but for that very reason, ought it not to be our aim to separate the cause of reform from theirs, and by that means to unite the Protestant interest against them, great part of which may otherwise remain united with them till it is too late? My reasoning, therefore, is that the Catholics will not be more disaffected in consequence of a reform; that the Protestants will be better satisfied; and that, therefore, by acceding to it, we shall most effectually guard against the real danger arising from the designs of the Catholics, formulated and supported by Foreign Powers. To the third objection the great and clear answer, I think, is that the Government can never be carried on to any good purpose by a majority *in Parliament alone*, if that Parliament becomes generally and lastingly unpopular. We may keep the Parliament, but lose the people.<sup>1</sup> I doubt, too, whether there is so much ground for apprehension from a Parliament more under the influence of a common interest with that of the body of the people. I have indeed before argued on the supposition that the seeds of discontent may continue in spite of any measures we may take; but still I think that, after settling liberally the commercial plan and agreeing to some reform, there could not immediately be any great national point of difference on which a Parliament, however constituted, would be likely to urge demands against the interests of this country. The people, by having to a certain degree a confidence in Parliament, will go to less excess than left to the guidance of every impulse without doors. At all events, even if the Parliament of Ireland should be brought to invent or countenance new demands which we could not grant, a stand must be made against them. Nor do I think this

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to note that Grattan used nearly the same words in writing to Edmund Burke on March 14, 1795: 'They will have the Parliament, but they have lost the people' (*Burke's Speeches*, iv. 294. Ridgeway).

country would be less able to make a stand *on good ground*, even against the Parliament, than with a Parliament on *questionable ground* against the people. You see the foundation of all my reasoning on the subject is on the supposition that a great part of the people is *really zealous in favour* of reform, and would be contented *with a practicable plan*. To judge fairly of this, however, I feel the want of a more local information than I have at present. I have stated to you in the most perfect confidence all the ideas that at present occupy my mind. But I am completely open to information and to reasoning.<sup>1</sup> I will beg you to let me know particularly, as far as you can ascertain, what you take to be the real temper of men's minds on both sides in this question, what is the number and weight of those who espouse the idea, and of those who are carried either by interest or opinion against it. For this purpose, whenever you are able, I would be glad to have an account of the leading parliamentary interests and the names and circumstances of the proprietors of boroughs. I wish, too, to learn from you fully and impartially whatever strikes you on the subject, and on any of the observations I have troubled you with. I feel and know its importance in a thousand respects, and I am most truly anxious to receive every light upon it. I do not wish to detain you longer at present, and possibly I may hear from you again before any messenger is despatched.

There are only one or two points on which I must add a few words. I feel extremely what you have at different times stated with regard to the Catholic levies, and I wish much to hear whether any mode has occurred to you in which it can be possible to check them. The thing appears to me to be of great delicacy. I have lately heard a great deal on Sir Patrick Bellew as being the efficient leader of that party. Have you any particular information concerning him? I enclose you a letter I received some little time since from Mr. Miles, and one which it contained from Sir E. Newenham to him. You will see I

<sup>1</sup> This all through life was one of Pitt's greatest characteristics. He was ever open to reason. 'No man ever listened more attentively to what was stated against his own opinions' (*Private Papers of William Wilberforce*, 1897. Fisher Unwin).

must beg you to return them. It seems to me that this letter is meant as a blind : I hardly think it can be prudent to endeavour to make any use of Mr. Miles under these circumstances. I wish to mention to you one thing more in entire confidence, and with regard to which I shall be much obliged to you for your opinion as speedily as possible. I have been trying what can be done on the subject of Lord Shelburne, and on which you know my earnest wishes. I believe there is a *resolution to create no dukes* not of the Royal Family. If that cannot be overcome, do you apprehend he will be pleased with the offer of a marquise? As far as that, would be practicable. Lord Temple must be included in the same promotion.

Adieu, my dear sir. Believe me to be, with greatest truth and regard, most faithfully and sincerely yours,

W. Pitt.

I hope to hear on the subject of Lord Mulgrave, Mr. Dillon, etc.

It is manifest that at this time there was great uneasiness felt by the Irish Executive in reference to treasonable and disloyal sentiments in the country, and their possible encouragement by foreign intrigues, and notably by France. Pitt deserves all the more credit for adhering unmoved to the path which he had marked out for himself of right and justice.

In the following letter of September 25, 1784,<sup>1</sup> to Orde, Pitt stated the necessity of establishing some fundamental principles in his policy with regard to Ireland, and discussed the danger of the Congress summoned to meet in Dublin in the next month, and which summoning was so vigorously interfered with by Fitzgibbon; and also referred to a suggestion of Orde's to consult the twelve judges as to the legality of the Con-

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

gress. Nothing definite in reference to this suggested consultation of the judges appears to have been actually done. Orde, in his subsequent letter (October 4, 1784), rather receded from the suggestion—stating obstacles in the way. He possibly was advised that he had no Constitutional power to consult the judges as to the legality of a matter of administrative policy and expediency. The judges may be summoned to the House of Lords to advise in its judicial proceedings, but the Executive could hardly expect judges to advise as to conduct the legality of which might afterwards have to be judicially investigated before them. Possibly Fitzgibbon's advice was deemed sufficient, and Pitt said he would also consult the Lord Chancellor and Lord Camden. Lord Mansfield in a letter<sup>1</sup> to Rutland on October 14, 1784, said plainly, 'You must not consult the English or Irish judges on any question ; they will not answer.'

Brighthelmstone : Saturday, September 25, 1784.

My dear Sir,—The volume which I wrote to you last Sunday I have detained till this time, in hopes of hearing from you before I sent a messenger. I received last night your letter of the 17th, brought by Mr. Mackenzie, and this morning that of the 20th, which accompanied the despatches to Lord Sydney. Much of what I had written does not apply to the precise circumstances of the present moment, but the general question to which it relates must depend in a great measure on the system ultimately to be pursued, and therefore I still send it, only repeating my earnest wish that you will write to me with the utmost freedom in answer to my speculations. At the distance I am, I know that I am not as capable of judging of all the circumstances as those who have a nearer view.

I desire only to hear fully your opinion when it differs from

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com., Rutland Correspondence*, iii. 143.

my own, and the *reasons and facts* which decide your mind. I am fully open to give the whole the most impartial consideration. The more I reflect upon it the more I feel the necessity of establishing some fundamental principles in our policy in regard to Ireland, and laying the ground of a permanent system. In this view I wish to discuss freely every point that can throw light on the subject, in order that when the line is once deliberately taken it may be unalterably adhered to.

When I speak thus of a system as a thing *still to be formed*, I do not mean that I have formed no fixed opinions with regard to any part of the present situation. On some leading points, as I trust you will have perceived in the tenor of all I have written, my mind is perfectly clear. The immediate subject of your late intelligence is one of them. Revolving as I am the general question of reform, I am decided in the opinion of resisting attempts to reform which either in their principle or mode of their being conducted strike at the foundation of Government. In this view I approve perfectly of the endeavours to check the Dublin meeting and everything of the same complexion. If these assemblies were for the purpose of appointing delegates to join in petitions or to concert on general Constitutional means of procuring a reform, I should hold such an object perfectly Constitutional, and of course such a meeting *perfectly legal*. But when the express purpose for which they are called is avowed to be (as it is in the Sheriffs' advertisement) to supersede both the form and substance of legal government by creating a new representative body under the appearance of regular authority, I have no doubt that such an attempt is highly unwarrantable. By the same reasoning the Congress (if ever it meets) will come under the same observation, if it assumes to itself the authoritative functions of a legal representative, and may thus require the interposition of executive government. But I think the distinction I mention, between *meeting to communicate sentiments on public matters* and to *concert legal measures and those of such a description as I have been speaking of*, of the utmost importance, both on account of the real principle in which such a distinction, I think, is founded, and on account of the construction which our conduct will

carry in the eye of the public, as well as the consequences to be produced by it. At all events, however just our principle, there cannot be too much caution in the manner of applying and enforcing it. I do not wish that prudence should extinguish spirit, but that the former should, by directing the exertions of the latter, secure its effect. I rely most fully on the Duke, as well as yourself, for the just and happy mixture of both. You will find, I promise you, the Government here fully disposed to do justice to your exertions, and ready to second you to the utmost. I am inclined to think what has happened in Dublin will strike such a damp on the party that the intended Congress cannot take place. . . . A representation mutilated as the Congress will be, by the opposition or neutrality of different parts of the kingdom, will not be able to impose even on the minds the most willing to bow to its authority. The discordant principles of which it will be composed will contribute still more to sink its importance. On every account, too much pains cannot be taken to encourage the salutary jealousy of the designs of the Catholics which begins to show itself. That capital line of division will rend asunder the whole fabric which has been rearing. Finally, too, in my opinion, the Protestant<sup>1</sup> interest must be the bond of union between Ireland and this country. I shall therefore look with the greatest eagerness for the issue of the meetings in all the different parts of the kingdom. Will you have the goodness, when you can, to send me a list of the counties where the attempt has succeeded and where failed, as well as the influence, if possible, which has governed them. This, *as well as the state of the parliamentary interests*, I should be glad to have as soon as possible. I have really great reluctance in troubling you so much, loaded as you are with business; but your zeal will, I am sure, allow for the motive which guides me. You say you mean to put questions to the twelve judges respecting the Congress. You will, I am sure, have thought of the necessity of keeping the question a secret till you are

<sup>1</sup> Grattan also had the strongest Protestant views. In 1793 he wrote: 'The Protestant interest my first object, I shall never assent to any measure tending to shake the security of property or to subvert the Protestant ascendancy.' *Miscell. Works*, 289: quoted by Mr. Lecky and Mr. T. D. Ingram.

certain of the answer and prepared for the measures in consequence. I should wish, for further satisfaction, to consult our lawyers here, particularly the Chancellor and Lord Camden. I shall, therefore, be obliged to you if you will send me the statement of the case you mean to put to your judges, and of the circumstances which throw any light on the character of the intended meeting. The time of the meeting is the 25th of October: we have, therefore, no time to lose in forming a decision.

In looking over the interceptions you sent me, I am at a loss to account for the style of Sir E. N.<sup>1</sup> Though zealous for reform, his expressions with regard to the Papists, and even as to the connection with this country, do not tally with the intelligence you received. It almost looks as if he meant these letters to be opened, and wrote his true sentiments through some other channel. I shall be glad to have back again his letters to me, with your opinion what I should do with regard to him, to correspond best with your measures. I forgot, in speaking of the Papists, to say how much I rejoice in the hope you entertain of bringing the better sort of them to declare publicly a just sense of their situation. No pains should be spared to promote so important and beneficial a measure. I am endeavouring to prepare myself with materials, as well as I can, for the commercial arrangements. In truth, without minute investigation of the particulars regarding it, no outline of our general policy can be formed. I am extremely glad that Mr. Foster and Mr. Beresford will visit this country. Their communications will be of the most essential importance, and even the appearance will be good. I should wish to induce them to be here, if they can, by the middle of next month. Perhaps, if it can be easily so arranged, Beresford's coming a week before Foster will be of use; as I should wish to take up the thread with him first, having already conversed with him on the subject. But what I shall most particularly wish is that you should have a full explanation from them of their ideas first, that I may have your observations, if possible, at least in general, before I discuss the subject with them. Foster will, I hope, by this time have communicated the whole of his ideas upon the

<sup>1</sup> Sir Edward Newenham.

Navigation Act. That is the capital point, but it is material to know his sentiments on the rest. Adieu, my dear sir. My anxiety on the subject depending, and the confidence with which I write to you, lead me to trouble you beyond all bounds. I hope you will have felt no material ill effects from the fatigue under which you wrote, and will find your health equal to the trial to which your exertions put it.

Believe me, ever faithfully and sincerely yours,

W. Pitt.

P.S.—I am in hopes I need not trouble you more on the solicitations which have been made to me, except about Lord Mulgrave. He will acquiesce with great good humour if his request is not granted; but still I find he has it a good deal at heart, with a view to regain his rank over peers junior to himself. Are any who were of that description, and who have already been made viscounts, on the list now to be earls?

I will write to the Duke in answer to his in a day or two.

Rt. Hon. Thomas Orde, etc.

Orde, in a very long letter<sup>1</sup> of October 4, 1784, gives his views as to the Congress and other matters, and refers to a ‘strange idea’ thrown out of electing Fox as a delegate to attend the Congress, and adds that the real view of the promoters was to work a separation between the two countries, but the great pretence was parliamentary reform.

In a letter of October 7, 1784,<sup>2</sup> to the Viceroy, Pitt deals with the question of reform :

‘I am aware you may have seen local difficulties, which may discourage you in this whole subject of reform, and make you doubt the possibility of applying our principles to Ireland, but let me beseech you to recollect that both your character and mine for consistency are at stake, unless there are unanswerable

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

<sup>2</sup> *Rutland Correspondence.*

proofs that the case of Ireland and England is different, and to recollect also that, however it is our duty to oppose the most determined spirit and firmness to ill-grounded clamour or factious pretensions, it is a duty equally indispensable to take care not to struggle but in a *right cause*.

In a letter<sup>1</sup> of the same date to Orde he shows how anxious he was to have this question fairly examined :

Downing Street : October 7, 1784.

My dear Sir,—In reflecting on my way to town on the subject of the letter which accompanies this, there seems to me one material circumstance : my wish not to withhold from you any thought which occurs to me makes me add this short postscript.

I have stated that the propriety or practicability of any plan of reform must be tried in a great measure by the temper of the people. I see how great the difficulty of your situation must be in this respect, because it must have naturally happened that the persons with whom you have necessarily most habits of intercourse must be those who are most interested against any plan of reform—that is to say, those who have the greatest share of present parliamentary interest.

What I venture to suggest for your consideration is, whether it be possible for you to gain any authentic knowledge (without committing yourself) of the extent of the numbers who are really zealous for reform, or of the ideas that would content them. By what I hear accidentally, the Protestant reformers are alarmed at the pretensions of the Catholics, and for that very reason would stop very short of the extreme speculative notions of universal suffrage. Could there be any way of your *confidentially* sounding Lord Charlemont without any danger ?

I am aware that you may have seen local difficulties which may discourage you on the whole subject of reform, and make you doubt the possibility of applying our principles to Ireland. But let me beseech you to recollect that both your character and mine for consistency are at stake, unless there are un-

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.* This letter is almost *verbatim* the same as that to Rutland of same date. See above extract.

answerable proofs that the case of Ireland and England is different; and to recollect also that, however it is our duty to oppose the most determined spirit and firmness to clamour, or factious pretensions, it is a duty equally indispensable to take care not to struggle but in a *right cause*. Adieu. I will not suffer myself to trouble you any more at present.

Ever yours,

W. Pitt.

The ‘Congress’ was held at the end of October and proved a fiasco. Orde writes<sup>1</sup> to Pitt on November 6, 1784: ‘Since the adjournment of Congress, our business has been to turn it into ridicule . . . Two or three *great men* among them, by too rash a reliance on the virtue of their privilege of delegates, having ventured to take their seats in the Exhibition Room, have been exposed to the rude hand of the bailiff or constable. . . . Among such a herd as this, consisting in all of but thirty-six persons, Mr. Flood did not disdain to class himself, when several persons of much inferior figure were ashamed of attending such an assembly. . . . It is thought fit to proceed by attachment, which the Attorney-General moved for yesterday, against the Sheriff of the county of Dublin, who was the first who summoned his Bailiwick for the express purpose of electing delegates. . . . In two counties, upon the refusal of the Sheriff, some Justices of the Peace chose to issue summonses for an assembly to choose delegates. These are also supposed to be fit subjects for an attachment, on account of their offence as Magistrates.’ He mentioned that Lord Mansfield had told Carleton, the Solicitor-General, that his opinion was decisive with regard to the illegality of the Sheriffs’

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

conduct, and to the propriety of proceeding against them, for example's sake, by way of attachment, and stated that the only real object of uneasiness at present was the conduct of the Catholics, and that attempts were made in the Liberty<sup>1</sup> to collect and drill a body of them. He adds: 'In this kingdom resistance is usually made to the execution of any judgments of the Courts of Law if the persons affected thereby are either popular characters or so desperate as to hire a party to maintain possession. In the county of Tipperary at present there exist some disagreeable proofs of this revolt against the laws, and by very bad management of the Magistrates in those parts a military assistance was rendered ineffectual to destroy a small garrison of lawless ruffians who still hold possession of an estate adjudged to another person.' How inveterate are some habits! Pitt's letter<sup>2</sup> of December 4, 1784, to the Duke of Rutland shows that the commercial resolutions were getting into shape, and also that he still thought the question of reform might develop into some feasible project. His words are strong as to his wishes: 'Parliamentary reform, I am still sure, after considering all you have stated, *must*, sooner or later, be carried in *both countries*. If it is well done, the sooner the better. I will write to you, by as early an opportunity as I can, the full result of all my reflections on the subject. For God's sake, do not persuade yourself in the meantime that the measure, if properly managed, and separated from every *ingredient of faction* (which I believe it may be), is incon-

<sup>1</sup> Part of old Dublin.

<sup>2</sup> *Rutland Correspondence*.

sistent with either the dignity or the tranquility and facility of Government. On the contrary, I believe *they* ultimately depend upon it. And if such a settlement is practicable, it is the only system that can be thought of. I write in great haste, and under a strong impression of these sentiments. You will perceive that this is merely a confidential and personal communication between you and myself, and therefore I need add no apology for stating so plainly what is floating in my mind on these subjects.'

In another 'most private' letter<sup>1</sup> of January 11, 1785, he addresses the Viceroy on the topics which were likely to require attention in Ireland in the approaching session, and shows that the difficulties in the way of reform had forced themselves on the attention of his Government. He says: 'The Cabinet were clearly of opinion, while the commercial arrangement is in agitation, as I found Mr. Orde was, and I have no doubt you will be, that it was advisable at all events to postpone discussing the question of reform till it has been decided here; and in the meantime it is certainly not the business of Government *to pledge itself to anything*. It would be unfair to make the friends of Government believe that any reform is at all events to be opposed: it would be unreasonable and imprudent to let them suppose it is at all events to be supported, which cannot be decided till the specific proposition, and all the circumstances under which it is to be brought forward, are known. This, therefore, is the main object—to keep Government from being considered as pledged in the interval, and

<sup>1</sup> *Rutland Correspondence*

to avoid, at this particular crisis, any step that would disgust our friends or loosen their support.'

In this letter Pitt refers to reform as an important matter to be inquired into, to be borne in mind, but in respect of which he rather took the position of an opportunist: it was 'certainly not the business of Government to pledge itself to anything.' Pitt's letters all show that he recognised the difficulties and obstacles in the way of reform in Ireland, and none of them indicate that he regarded his commercial policy as dependent upon reform or any other question.

In his letters of January 1785 one can readily appreciate the reasoning which he thought demanded and justified the resolutions. In his 'secret' letter<sup>1</sup> of January 6, 1785, to the Duke of Rutland, he alluded to the relations which must subsist between the two countries—the 'essential point of reciprocity'—'that they should be one in the communication of advantages, and of course in the participation of burdens; ' and he discussed the return 'which reason and justice entitle us to expect Ireland would make for the great commercial advantages she was about to receive.' He uses no unworthy words: 'In the relation of Great Britain [with Ireland] there can subsist but two possible principles of connection. The one, that which is exploded, of total subordination in Ireland, and of restrictions on her commerce for the benefit of this country, which was by this means enabled to bear the whole burden of the empire; the other is what is now proposed to be confirmed and completed, that of an equal participation

<sup>1</sup> *Rutland Correspondence.*

of all commercial advantages, and some proportion of the charge of protecting the general interest. If Ireland is at all connected with this country, and to remain a member of the empire, she must make her option between these two principles, and she has wisely and justly made it for the latter. But if she does not think this system for her advantage as well as ours, and if she sets any value either on the confirmation and security of what has been given her, or on the possession of what is now within her reach, she can attain neither without performing on her part what both reason and justice entitle us to expect.'

In a postscript to his letter<sup>1</sup> to Orde of January 19, Pitt refers to titles, as to which he had frequent requests, and said he would write soon 'about the marquisates, etc.,' and that there was no harm in giving strong hopes, but that positive engagements should be avoided. The applications for peerages were then very numerous and needed great prudence and caution.

In another letter<sup>2</sup> of January 28, 1785, to Orde, Pitt discusses several 'points as yet unsettled,' and says: 'It seems absolutely necessary that Ireland should lay the same duties as exist from time to time in Great Britain on foreign articles exported to the Colonies;' and again: 'It seems understood, according to the resolutions, that the goods imported from one country into the other shall be exported as free from burden as goods of the produce of the country itself.'

This is the language of a Minister who was taking a clear and sensible view of a business matter.

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

Orde had to introduce the resolutions into the Irish House of Commons on February 7, and Pitt's letter<sup>1</sup> of February 1 to Orde is interesting as showing the close and anxious way in which the question of the contribution from Ireland for Imperial purposes was regarded by the Cabinet, and the very distinct and positive instructions that were given to Orde on the subject :

My dear Sir,—I need trouble you but shortly on the important subject depending, as after the fullest deliberation Lord Sydney's despatch contains the result of all our opinions and sentiments upon it. You will there see the utmost latitude which it is possible for us to give; and even that we could never have brought ourselves to but in the reliance you will have recourse to every possible expedient rather than make the last concessions authorised by it. If you can carry the idea of appropriating the surplus by *Irish authority* to the discharge of our debt, it will be the happiest of all ends to this business; and this country, as well as Ireland, will have to thank you for ever. I really think, in spite of all the prejudices against paying our debt, the Irish objections to our proposition in its former shape give a fair opening for this. It is one of those ideas which may succeed by being taken with address and vigour at a lucky moment. It certainly satisfies the Constitutional jealousy of an Irish Parliament. It is the strongest possible pledge of affection to the sister kingdom; and it will pay Ireland, as it will relieve this country by the stability and credit it will give to our general credit. As to the money going out of the kingdom, it is, between ourselves, an idle idea.

It may be well to humour the prejudice a little, if it can be of use (which in case of adopting the other schemes it may). But the matter is, if Irish money is spent in Irish commodities for the service of the navy, it will prevent so much English money coming for that purpose. Disguise it as you will, there can be no contribution for any purpose but your internal Government or immediate local benefit; that is, in other words, there can be nothing *that at all deserves the name of contribution*

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

which does not either carry money out of the kingdom, or prevent money coming into it, which is the same thing.

Why should Ireland be afraid of this, especially when the money will come out of augmented wealth, and will leave her in a great proportion richer than she is now? Besides this, she tells us in the same breath that the sum will be too little to be an object. But is it supposed that the sending money out of the country will be a grievance peculiar to Ireland? The fact is that we cannot provide for any of our foreign services (which very services are as much for the benefit of Ireland as our own) without doing the very same thing. The pay, the victualling our troops, the expense of fortifications in Canada, in the East and West Indies, at Gibraltar, the whole expense of our navy while on foreign stations, are all so many drains for the treasure of this country. But we bear it, and gain by it, because the intercourse and commerce which this expense protects brings in, by its returns, more money than it takes out. Just so it is with Ireland, which is interested in all our foreign possessions: and just so it must be with any country which has any concerns, outside of its domestic circle, which it thinks worth improving or defending.

There is only this difference, which is strongly in favour of the scheme for a sinking fund—that the money thus sent, instead of being in fact applied to more remote services, goes no further than England. And from England it may be carried back to Ireland, by the channels of a trade of which the balance (as far as respects the mere interchange of the manufactures of Great Britain and Ireland) is greatly in favour of the latter. I really think if I were an Irish patriot who was forced to acknowledge the necessity of some contribution I should be happy to embrace this, for the sake both of policy and dignity. Let me conjure you, if you see a chance, to press it to the utmost; and not to be discouraged by the trite objection that the debt is not of their contracting. Ireland must *directly* and *indirectly* assist in discharging it, if she contribute to the general expense at all.

If this idea cannot be carried, the only other which is tolerably satisfactory is that contained in Paper No. 1, enclosed by Lord Sydney. Beyond that, surely you cannot be driven to

concede. If you encounter further difficulties, pray let me know *precisely from whom and the particular parliamentary interests on which you cannot depend if you push the business.* With the turn things have now taken, you cannot be afraid of the consequences, at least of this proposition, without doors.

If (which God forbid) everything else fails, we must have recourse to the last expedient, No. 3, which is just better than nothing, because with it we may venture to bring forward here the commercial arrangement, and with less than this we certainly could not stir a step. I have only to add a word as to the general arguments against contribution now in the shape proposed. They amount only, I think, to this, that people choose to call it only a *tribute* and a bargain. Perhaps it is answer enough to say that it cannot be both. In truth, a bargain—that is a *compact for mutual advantage*—is the strongest instance of independent authority, and, as such, Ireland cannot quarrel with it. And the nature of the bargain is this:—You bargain to *pay a small share in the general defence.* We bargain to give you a complete share in the general advantage. As to the word *tribute*, it seems to me that a sum given voluntarily by one country in consequence of a compact formed by mutual consent with another, given for purposes, too, in which it is itself interested, and with the power of seeing that it is thus applied, has everything to distinguish it from a tribute which can separate one idea from the other.

I must not forget to add that the resolution you sent me for confining the Irish consumption to our colonies seems clearly right. The substance of it is indeed indispensable, and in all our conversations we understood that there was no difference of opinion about the thing; though until your letter on the subject I was not precisely aware of the steps necessary to secure it. I trust you will at all events insist upon it. You will receive from Lord Sydney the resolution on the subject of mutual preference over other European countries. The subject is so complex that we cannot hazard the resolution as tight as it was first drawn, but it may be of use to declare the principle in this general way. I send by this messenger a letter written some days ago in answer to your Memo, and I return your resolution with one or two marginal notes. You will consider what

is suggested with regard to the drawbacks on manufactures re-exported, and with regard to bounties from societies, both of which may be material. I think that the resolutions as they now stand say nothing expressly about the duties on colonial produce imported into Ireland. When the colony trade was opened, it was understood that your duties should *be precisely the same*. I am not sure whether, particularly with regard to sugar, Ireland has not proceeded on a calculation to make the price in both countries, instead of having *precisely the same duty*; which last I take it was certainly intended. The same thing ought to be extended to rum, etc., and I flatter myself you will have no difficulty in making this point clear. I have been much concerned that your messenger has necessarily been so long detained. I fear it will now not be possible that you should propose your resolutions before Monday next. You will undoubtedly take care to open those for the contribution with the others, and to pass them at the same time, which seems indispensable. We shall wait impatiently and anxiously the event.

I am, dear sir,

Most faithfully and sincerely yours,

W. PITT.

Downing Street: Feb. 1, 1785.

I have been obliged to write to the Duke on the subject of Gardiner and Stewart's peerages,<sup>1</sup> on which the circumstances make me very anxious.

Orde submitted the first form of the resolutions to the Irish Parliament on February 7, 1785. They permitted the importation without any increased duty of all produce from other countries through Ireland into Great Britain, and into Ireland through Great Britain; they reduced the duty on the manufactures and produce of both countries to the scale of whichever country had the lowest duties; and they provided a contribution from Ireland for Imperial purposes.

<sup>1</sup> Gardiner obtained the title of Viscount Mountjoy, and was father of the Earl of Blessington. Stewart was created Baron Londonderry in 1789, and subsequently Viscount, Earl and Marquis of Londonderry.

Orde wrote to Pitt on the 7th, the day of his speech, and received a reply<sup>1</sup> from him dated February 11 :

Downing Street : Feb. 11, 1785.

My dear Sir,—I trust, from your letter of the 7th, which I received only this morning, that the substance of your propositions, though not altogether what we wished, will be certainly carried in a shape tolerably satisfactory. The objections hitherto made seem only to have given you an opportunity of stating more fully the advantageous ground on which you put them. I wait with impatience the further result. We shall not open the business here till we learn that the resolutions have been agreed to in your House of Commons. In the meantime, there are two points on which I wish to mention to you what occurs to me, in the hope that it may possibly not be too late. I think it seems clearly desirable that the resolutions should be communicated at a conference, or whatever other mode seems the most regular, to the House of Lords. Probably you will have decided on this step before this letter can reach you, which will be Monday night or Tuesday morning. If not, unless you see any reason to the contrary, I should wish that step to be taken as soon after as you conveniently can. It is the mode we must pursue here, and it seems best it should be similar on both sides of the water.

There is another point, of much more consequence, on which I am afraid of some mistake. The account of the produce of the hereditary revenue to March 25 last (enclosed in your letter) makes the total of that revenue 659,000*l.* But an account that Foster left here (made up to the same period, on which our former calculations were founded) made it but 554,000*l.* The difference appears to arise from a different proportion of the produce on wines, tobacco, and sugar being carried to the additional duties. . . . I trust before this letter reaches you your success will have proved as complete as the most favourable expectations could state it. A contribution (though I will not use the word) which leaves the appropriation from time to time to the Irish Parliament is certainly (as I before stated it) so much better than nothing that it will be well worth having.

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

I congratulate you that Brownlow could only speak Daggers, and that even those seemed somewhat blunted.

W. Pitt.

Notwithstanding all the directions of Pitt, Orde, under the exigencies of debate in the Irish House of Commons, made concessions beyond the contemplation and wishes of the Cabinet. The idea of the Government was that the contribution should each year be the surplus of the hereditary revenue, which, after much examination and some changes, was fixed at a certain sum. This would secure, if the surplus revenue was kept up and duly levied, a fixed contribution annually from Ireland. Objections were taken in the Irish House of Commons to this form of resolution, and the contribution in time of peace was made contingent upon the establishment of a balance between revenues and expenditure.

Pitt wrote to Orde<sup>1</sup> on February 24, pointing out that the change made the surplus, and therefore any contribution, precarious :

Downing Street: February 24, 1785.

My dear Sir,—The long dispatch which the Duke will receive from Lord Sydney will inform you fully of our proceedings and our opinions, and makes it totally unnecessary for me to enter into any further detail. I am unwilling to detain the messenger a moment. I only wish to repeat that we are ready to admit the resolutions were made on the idea of a pressing necessity, and of the supposition of their being conducive to the general object. I must, however, confess that I wish any consequence had been risked rather than such a concession.

It is and will be considered here as rendering the whole effect of the surplus *precarious*. Everything, therefore, depends upon having the difficulty removed.

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

You will, I am sure, spare no exertion, and I trust it may be happily accomplished. If this is adjusted, I think, notwithstanding every act of opposition, we can answer for the rest; but without it we cannot stir a step beyond the conditional approbation given in the resolution, of which you have a copy in Lord Sydney's dispatch. I rejoice to find that if this essential point is well settled you have so good a prospect of success in other matters. You shall hear from me upon all of them speedily; this, however, is more important than them all, and on this our opinions, as stated in the dispatch, are unalterable. Rose has written to you on two or three points on which we very much wish explanation.

W. Pitt.

Rose,<sup>1</sup> the Secretary to the Treasury, who was in daily communication with Pitt on the subject, and knew all that was going on in London, wrote<sup>2</sup> on the same day to Orde his views of the position:

I have never felt a greater impatience in my life to write than during these three or four days past, but I found it impossible to communicate with you, and much less with anyone else on your side of the water, on the subject of the interesting business now depending, till Mr. Pitt should write himself to the Duke and you. I have been the more uneasy because it is impossible to doubt of the anxiety you must have been in all the time. The admission of the alteration in the last resolution, which you found yourself compelled to, struck everyone here immediately as leaving the matter short of the intention of securing the eventual surplus of the hereditary revenue. Mr. Pitt is most

<sup>1</sup> The Right Hon. George Rose, M.P., appointed Secretary of the Treasury, 1782, under Lord Shelburne; and again in 1783, under Pitt, and so remained until 1801. Vice-President of Board of Trade and joint Paymaster-General, 1804-6; again Vice-President of Board of Trade, and Vice-Treasurer of Navy, 1807-18; Clerk of Parliament, 1788. An intimate friend of Pitt, and contributed 1,000*l.* to the private fund got up to pay his debts on his resignation; the grandfather of Sir William Rose, late Clerk of Parliament, and Sir Hugh Rose, Lord Strathnairn; died 1818.

<sup>2</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

thoroughly satisfied that in giving way you acted for the best, and with the purest intentions of concluding the business in a manner the least likely upon the whole to be attended with ill-effects ; but, convinced as he is of the absolute necessity of adhering to his former determination, and compelled to attend to the opinion of the others, he finds it impossible to propose the several resolutions agreed upon till the tenth is restored to its original meaning, either in form or substance. This he persuades himself will yet not be difficult to effect. Ireland has it always in her own power to keep up her revenue to her expenses, and it is surely unreasonable she should make that a condition of any assistance she means to give to the support of the general strength of the empire. As Mr. Pitt lays some stress upon that, Mr. Fox chose to take the ground of saying that he had not the least doubt of Ireland religiously keeping her faith in that respect, but he was sure she would equalise her revenue at least to her expenses, but that he was equally sure there was the utmost danger where Mr. Pitt apprehended none, in the execution of the laws for securing the commerce and navigation of this country, which must in future depend upon the revenue officers in Ireland, who would be encouraged publicly to relax in all the necessary regulations, and to admit foreign produce of the West India colonies into Ireland, which would again be shipped for this country. When Mr. Pitt urged that the danger of Ireland becoming the emporium of trade was greatly magnified, Mr. Fox referred to your speech in the Irish House, and said Mr. Pitt's was an answer to it, but that you had the best of the argument.

There must have been the suspicion of a smile on ‘the fine Atlantic of his countenance’ when Fox twitted Pitt with not being equal in argument to his own Chief Secretary !

Pitt's time was fully occupied for the next two months in passing the resolutions, with amendments and changes, through the ordeal of debate in the English House of Commons, and facing an Opposition

which spared no effort in England and Ireland to defeat his policy and upset his scheme.

Orde all this time was at his post, working at Dublin Castle and in Parliament to aid the Duke of Rutland in the general administration of Ireland. It will be noticed that in Pitt's letters he continually asked Orde to furnish him with the particulars of the parliamentary interests in Ireland.

Orde appears to have made a study of the question. He kept a pocket-book (presumably, from its appearance, for daily and constant use) with the names of the members of the Irish House of Commons on separate pages, in alphabetical order, and in it were entered all particulars<sup>1</sup> as to their wishes, ambitions, hopes, fears, and also the names of those through whom they could be influenced.

He had a list endorsed 'A curious paper showing the price of every Irish M.P.', but a perusal of the contents does not support the coarse candour of the description. Opposite each name there are words or references that might be useful hints. Thus, after the name of Vesey Colclough is written, 'see him'; after Corry, 'place—too high'; after Cuff, 'various—has good place'; after Rt. Hon. Daly, 'see him—unaccountable'; after Sir B. Denny, 'peerage, but now cannot be'; after Archdale, 'rank, &c.'; after, Blakeney 'has pension'; after Brooke, 'not to be depended on'; after Hon. D. Browne, 'patriotic.'

There is another of Orde's papers headed 'Abstract divisional view of the House of Commons of Ireland,'

<sup>1</sup> Massey's *History of England*, iii. 264.

which accounted for the 300 members under the following headings: ‘Leading interests for, 86; brought in by Government, 12; in place, &c., 44; expectant and independent, 44; hopeful, 9; doubtful, 20; leading interests against, 30; against, 52; vacant seats, 2; Mr. Pelham, 1.’ After the majority of the particular names of the members there is generally a word in red ink, such as ‘expectant,’ ‘pension,’ ‘office,’ ‘solicits,’ ‘obliged,’ ‘peerage,’ ‘occasional favours,’ ‘caprice,’ ‘well disposed,’ ‘occasionally favourable,’ ‘popular,’ ‘very extravagant,’ ‘popular interest.’ Grattan is classed with the ‘doubtful’ and Henry Flood as ‘against,’ but there is an honourable blank opposite both names. Lord Shannon has 16 members under the ‘leading interests for,’ and Mr. Ponsonby 14 with the same heading; while in the ‘leading interests against’ appear the names of the Duke of Leinster with 7 members, and Lord Charlemont with 2. Lord Edward Fitzgerald’s name is included in the Duke of Leinster’s list, but (as might be expected) no words follow it.

Orde never spared himself in writing letters. He wrote day after day to London during the proceedings on the commercial resolutions, and on one day, July 28, 1785, he wrote two letters to Rose, and two also to Beresford, on the subject. Although generally a formal writer, he wrote freely to them. Thus, in writing to Beresford, he alludes to the Irish ‘Maladie du pays,’ ‘the rage of circulating a secret’; he tells Rose ‘we shall blow our enemies to the Devil.’ He could show clearly and well how pride, and not substance, was wrecking the commercial resolutions. He says in his

letter<sup>1</sup> of July 19, 1785, to Beresford, ‘One word of gratification to the independent pride of the country would do more than concessions of commercial benefit :’ and in a letter to him<sup>2</sup> on the 28th of the same month, he says : ‘It is grievous to be defeated because of a contest of mere punctilio. It is too provoking to find resistance to a phantom, when it is clearly demonstrated that it has no power to harm.’ The following sentence in a letter Orde wrote to Pitt on February 17, 1787, has almost too modern a look to have been written over a century : ‘People in the South direct their menaces against increase of rents or change of tenants, and they entirely prevent the punishment of their crimes by deterring persons from giving evidence.’

Orde had a rare gift of writing letters of courteous and charming evasion, postponement, ambiguity, hesitation and regret to applicants for place or preferment. He never gave an unqualified negative : he always hinted at the ‘pleasures of hope,’ which are so easily nurtured by the ‘pleasures of the imagination.’

The following<sup>3</sup> shows how the most private circumstances of the Chief Secretary’s family were made an opportunity for appealing to his influence :

Dublin Castle : February 3, 1786.

Sir,—I beg leave to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, and to thank you at the same time for your very polite congratulations on the late increase of my family. I can scarcely entertain a doubt that the Lord-Lieutenant, who was aware of your preference of an active life to the ennui of retirement, would be glad of an occasion to commute your pension for office. No opportunity has as yet presented itself for that pur-

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

pose : I shall be glad to find that at any other time it may be in his Grace's power to gratify you more according to your inclinations.

Mons. de Raveney.

Yours, &c.,  
T. ORDE.

Orde knew how to meet ambiguities that might mean threats in application for favours. He wrote to a member who put forth his pretensions : 'I hope I am mistaken in apprehending from the style in which you conclude your letter any declaration of doubt of the support of His Majesty's Government, because I am confident that my Lord-Lieutenant is totally unable, as well as unwilling, to hold out any expectations to a gentleman whose resolution in that respect is uncertain. His Grace's Government does not find itself under the necessity of conciliating support upon such terms or under such impressions. I shall be glad to have the honour of receiving your answer, that I may communicate it to His Grace.'

The Viceroy himself did not escape many direct applications for his patronage. Some are curious, and suggest more audacity than power of service. A Mr. O'Byrne wrote<sup>1</sup> to him : 'Although we differ a little in politics, give me leave to introduce my friend, Mr. Doyle. He has, however, the misfortune of differing with you, as I do, in a few trifling particulars, which I fear will prevent him taking a public decided part with you. . . . Stick to Doyle. A word to the wise.'

It is interesting to find amongst the correspondence of the Duke of Rutland a letter<sup>2</sup> from Lord Mornington

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. MSS. Com., Rutland Correspondence*, iii. 76.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* iii. 266. There is also an interesting letter from Arthur Wellesley to Lord Mornington on June 17, 1793, saying that he under-

about the future Duke of Wellington : ‘ Let me remind you of a younger brother of mine, whom you were so kind as to take into your consideration for a commission in the army. He is here at this moment, and perfectly idle. It is a matter of indifference to me what commission he gets, provided he gets it soon.’

Orde offered to resign several times, owing to the state of his health, but was induced to stay on at the request of Pitt and the Duke of Rutland. He was, however, about to retire when the too early death of the Viceroy occurred. Freedom from worry and work to some extent restored his health. He subsequently took an interest in county affairs, became Lord-Lieutenant of Hampshire<sup>1</sup> after his elevation to the Peerage, assumed the name of Orde-Powlett on his wife’s succeeding to the Bolton property, and terminated a useful and respected life in the year 1807.

stood the Government intended to form a corps to send abroad, under the command of officers taken from the different regiments, and that he would like to go with them : ‘ The way in which you can assist me is to ask Mr. Pitt to desire Lord Westmorland to send me as major to one of the flank corps. If they are to go abroad, they will be obliged to take the officers from the line, and they may as well take me as anybody else ; but if you think that it would be improper to apply to Mr. Pitt upon this occasion, I will refer it to Lord Westmorland myself. I think it both dangerous and improper to remove any part of the army from this country at present, but if any part of it is to be moved I should like to go with it, and have no chance of seeing service except with the flank corps, as the regiment I have got into as major is the last for service.

‘ Believe me, my dear Mornington,  
‘ Yours most affectionately,  
‘ A. WELLESLEY.’

<sup>1</sup> Before he was appointed to that high office, it would appear that the curious course had been taken of putting it in commission. It is stated in the *Carlisle Papers* that in 1793 ‘ the Lieutenancy of Hants was taken from the possessor on account of some manœuvres about the Militia, but the intention is to preserve it in his family, and with that view it is to be put in commission’ (*Hist. MSS. Com.*, 15 Rep. Ap., Part 6).

## CHAPTER IV

## PITT'S CORRESPONDENCE ON THE COMMERCIAL RESOLUTIONS

Pitt to Rutland—Lord Sydney's official despatch—Cooke—Resolutions in the English Parliament—Pitt had at same time to remember effect in Ireland of any changes made—Examination of witnesses at the Bar—Pitt anxious that his ground should be good—Necessity for perpetuating the laws of collecting—Parliamentary reform—Remodeling and enlargement of resolutions—Orde 'terrified' at changes—Pitt resolute—Fox's speeches—Identical laws for trade and navigation—and for collection of hereditary revenue—Mr. Gladstone and our trade circle—His approval of Pitt—Pitt's letters to Orde and Rutland—Beresford's account of debate in House of Lords—Sheridan—Beresford suspected Pitt's colleagues—Orde's admiration of Pitt—But objected to resolutions coming back to Ireland—Pitt would not 'fritter down'—Rose—Pitt would not yield—Result—Grattan's speech—Curran's—Practical defeat—Dublin illuminated—Letters to Pitt—Cooke—Flood—Argument for Union—Fox and Burke factions—Mr. Morley's judgment.

THE following letter<sup>1</sup> to the Duke of Rutland is a fine specimen of flattery, encouragement and persuasion :

Downing Street : Thursday, March 3, 1785.

My dear Duke,—I write to you with a degree of satisfaction which I cannot express, in anticipating (I trust not prematurely) the happy conclusion of your labours in the important work now depending. I feel at the same time that much is still left for address and exertion; but I am confident they will be fully adequate to the task, and I really think there is nothing now remains that ought to be an obstacle between the two countries.

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.* The *Rutland Correspondence* shows the prodigious industry of Pitt in often writing on the same subjects, on the same day, to the Viceroy and to the Chief Secretary.



Rt Hon John Buxfield

## CHAPTER IV

## PITT'S CORRESPONDENCE ON THE COMMERCIAL RESOLUTIONS.

Pitt to Rutland—Low Country's official Report—Gibraltar—Instructions to the English?—Pitt had at some time or other written to the Duke of York of his thoughts on the ground should he go to Sicily to quell the rebellion of Palermo—Palermo had been abandoned and the rebels were now in possession—He described an alternative route from Sicily to Malta—Should have been ready and navigable—The condition of Sicily—Mr. Gladstone left our side—We agreed of Pitt's Letters to Ogle and Holland—The condition of Malta in House of Lords—Sir John Lubbock's speech—The administration of Pitt—The Duke of Wellington's speech—The small and large colonies—Canning's—Practical lesson—Dublin remonstrated—Letters to Pitt—Cost—Flood—Argument for Union—Pitt and Dublin before Mr. Morley's judgment.

THE following letter<sup>1</sup> to the Duke of Rutland is a fine specimen of flattery, encouragement and persuasion:

Darwin House, Friday, June 2, 1802.

My dear Duke,—I write to you with a degree of solicitude which I cannot express in words (I must not prematurely) the happy conclusion of your labours on the important work now depending. I feel at the same time that much is still left for address and exertion; but I am confident they will be fully adequate to the task, and I really think there is nothing now remaining that ought to be in common between the two countries.

<sup>1</sup> Julian MS. The second correspondence shows the postlude history of Pitt's letter relating to the same subject on the same day to Mr. Viscount and to the Chief Secretary.



after John Hoppner

Walker & Boutell, pub.

Rt Hon. John Beresford.



You will see by Lord Sydney's despatch and the drafts enclosed that we have endeavoured to put the business into such a train as may preserve the main and indispensable object, and at the same time accommodate it to the principles already adopted and declared in Ireland. On the commercial points (be the opposition what it may, and I think it will be less than was threatened) we shall give you full and complete satisfaction. On the subject of contribution, we ask no more in *substance* than what, according to your construction of the Irish resolutions, you have given us already. What we ask, however, is indispensable to satisfy ourselves and to satisfy this country; and, obtaining this, we are ready to seal the compact without delay. The principle of internal economy which you found it necessary to couple with this settlement, we not only do not reject, but approve and commend it. We only state that to enforce this economy is the separate province and duty of the Irish Parliament, not ours. The Parliament of this country, who are the parties to this bargain, can have no power to control your internal expenses. The bargain ought, therefore, not to be made subject to a contingency on which no exertions of our Parliament can have any effect. On the contrary, the Parliament of Ireland, who have annually the power of giving or refusing the additional duties, and will be secured in the more effectual exercise of this great Constitutional privilege by this very arrangement, have the means of examining and checking every article of the public expense. It is surely degrading and humiliating to the Parliament of Ireland to suppose that they must have recourse to any other aid for this purpose, and to make them acknowledge themselves unequal to the peculiar and characteristic functions of the representatives of a free kingdom.

In short, I am really persuaded, if I can trust my own feelings on this subject, that every able and disinterested friend to the dignity and interest of Ireland—such a man, for instance, as Mr. Grattan—will, upon reflection, see every object he can have at heart better consulted on this plan than according to the Irish resolutions themselves. The principles of economy may still be held sacred, but the care of them will be committed

to their natural guardians, the Irish Parliament. All the objects of commercial equality will be attained, and the whole arrangement will be established on the best of all securities, the mutual satisfaction of both countries. With such a prospect as this before them, surely the disinterested and rational part of Ireland cannot hesitate to close on the terms now suggested. It is true that these terms are in the mode of them different from those originally voted in the Irish Parliament, but can that be a ground for rejecting them, and introducing a fresh scene of confusion? Let Ireland recollect the nature of this whole proceeding. It is, in fact, a sort of treaty between two independent kingdoms, to be confirmed in the Parliament of each. The basis of this treaty is *first proposed to the Irish Parliament*. In all that relates to the commercial arrangements this proposal is agreed to without variation; in *one part* only (and that point, the consideration to be given by Ireland in return) an alteration is desired by Great Britain, which in substance requires *nothing additional* from Ireland, but which in point of security is *everything to us*. With this one alteration agreed to, everything else is secured in the very shape Ireland proposes it.

Under these circumstances, can any man living venture to maintain that it is inconsistent with the dignity or even the pride of Ireland to meet our wishes on such fair and liberal ground? I really cannot suffer myself to entertain a doubt on the subject. I therefore conclude in full confidence that your efforts will be successful in a cause in which your own reputation, and that of all our friends here, is not more involved than the interest of every man who has a concern in the strength and welfare of the whole empire.

Adieu, &c.,

W. Pitt.

His letter<sup>1</sup> of the same date to Orde also shows the importance that Pitt attached to the subject.

The following is the official despatch<sup>2</sup> of Lord

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

Sydney, written on the same day, referred to in each of Pitt's letters. The style is rather stilted and high-flown, having regard to present ideas, and it is difficult to conceive one department of Government writing to another nowadays in such language of compliment :

Whitehall : March 3, 1785.

My Lord,—By Mr. Cooke, who arrived here on Tuesday last, I was favoured with your Grace's despatch of the 25th of last month.

I have the pleasure to acquaint your Grace that, though it was utterly impossible for His Majesty's Ministers to accede to the alterations made in the resolutions, they are perfectly satisfied that the principles upon which your Grace admitted them were the same which have so honourably carried you through the many important transactions of your administration.

Your Grace will be pleased to understand that it never was the wish of the King's servants to interfere with the economical arrangements of the Parliament of Ireland, but that we felt ourselves bound to show to the Parliament and people of Great Britain that every possible security was given to the permanency of the contribution for the support of the general interests of the empire. . . . This important object once completely obtained, must place your Grace's administration of the Kingdom of Ireland certainly amongst the most fortunate as well as meritorious that ever has existed, and ensure to your Grace the credit and satisfaction which deservedly belong to you, who will have confirmed the permanent happiness and prosperity of both kingdoms.

SYDNEY.

Mr. Cooke,<sup>1</sup> referred to in this letter, was then employed in the Chief Secretary's office, and his name appears frequently in the public life of the next thirty years.

<sup>1</sup> Edward Cooke, son of the Provost of King's College, Cambridge, was placed by Eden in the Chief Secretary's office; 1789, succeeded C F. Sheridan as Under Secretary, War Department; 1795, removed by

Pitt, in the midst of all his toil working the commercial resolutions through the English House of Commons, had always to keep steadily in view that the opinions of the Irish Parliament had to be borne in mind and the difficulties of the Irish Executive remembered. The resolutions were to lead up to Bills which should be passed in each Parliament. The Viceroy and Chief Secretary, during the struggle at Westminster, were naturally thinking how what was said and done there would affect the success of the measure which must be founded on the ultimate shape of the resolutions, and which it would be Orde's duty to present to the Irish House of Commons.

Pitt's letters show the pains he took to keep his Irish colleagues informed of the true bearing of what was occurring, and, if possible, to carry them with him in his action :<sup>1</sup>

Putney Heath : Monday, April 4, 1785.

My dear Duke,— . . . The delay occasioned by examinations<sup>2</sup> at the bar is vexatious, but any premature attempt to

Lord Fitzwilliam, but reinstated by Lord Camden on his arrival; 1796, succeeded Mr. Hamilton as Under Secretary, Civil Department; acted under Lord Castlereagh during the Irish rebellion and during the Union debates; appointed Under Secretary of War and Colonies of England when Lord Camden became Secretary of State; 1806, removed during the administration of 'The Talents'; 1807, reinstated under Lord Castlereagh; retired in 1817, and died 1819. He wrote the pamphlet in favour of the Union to which Bushe (afterwards Chief Justice) replied by one entitled *Cease your Funning*. The portion of Cooke's pamphlet about revenue and finance was by Beresford, and was so highly thought of by the Government that it was separately circulated, Cooke's work, as a whole, not being much approved of. (See *Beresford Correspondence*, ii.)

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

<sup>2</sup> The examination of witnesses at the Bar in Committee of the whole House was the procedure then adopted. If the practice ever prevailed to any extent, it would now appear to have fallen into desuetude.

shorten it might have the contrary effect, and the more the subject is discussed the more our cause will be benefited in the end. Mr. Orde is in possession of the only two alterations, or rather explanations, of any consequence which have hitherto appeared necessary in the commercial resolutions. They are of consequence here, and cannot be fairly objected to in Ireland. We may possibly find some further explanation necessary as to other points in them, and little inaccuracies may be discovered, but you may be assured that nothing will tempt me to abandon in any respect the principle and spirit of the resolutions. There are melancholy prophets here (as is always the case) who are not without their fears, but I do not myself entertain a doubt of complete success.

Ever, &c.,  
W. Pitt.

The next letter<sup>1</sup> shows that Pitt looked more to the country's gain than to any loss of popularity, and how keenly he desired that his ground should be 'good' :

Downing Street : April 16, 1785.

My dear Duke,—I do not persecute you with long letters, as the answers I have written to Orde, I take for granted, come to you, and I therefore save you the trouble of repetition ; but I cannot let this messenger go without saying in a few words to yourself how happy I am in thinking, notwithstanding temporary difficulties and delays, that we are in truth within sight of our great object. The clamours on this side will gradually sink from patience and perseverance. Our strength in Parliament, if we are enabled, as I trust we shall be, to fight on good grounds and on consistent principles throughout, will not, I believe, be materially affected by the objections propagated without doors. And though we may lose a little in popularity for the time, I am sure we shall ultimately gain—at least the country will, which is enough.

To this prospect it is essential, however, that our *ground* should, as I have said, be *good*. I am sure every assistance and

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

exertion that can be used towards making it so we shall have from you. I know that you have on your side difficulties and prejudices and follies to encounter—on many occasions more than we have, but in this particular business you are surely further advanced, and have less to struggle with. You may perhaps be able to smooth our difficulties without much increasing your own. Of all the points now in question, the most essential is the perpetuating the laws for the collection of the hereditary revenue. No real objection is, I think, stated to it, and we really feel it indispensable. For God's sake, let people feel how necessary it is for the consistency of the plan, and do not let it be supposed possible that Ireland will refuse to us a demand so innocent and so reasonable. Adieu.

Ever yours, &c.,

W. PITT.

In a letter<sup>1</sup> to Orde of the same date, he again presses the necessity for perpetuating the laws of collecting: ‘It is really, in point of principle and argument, indispensable; nor can I feel that there is any tenable ground against it. It is not very important whether it is secured by a clause in the Appropriation Act or a separate Bill, but I think the first way much the best, and I should imagine it would give you the least trouble. We are going on here tediously, but we every day gain ground towards the main object; and the enemy begin to be a little tired, though not yet ashamed of the delay.’

Lord Sydney, writing to the Viceroy a ‘Secret and Separate’ letter<sup>2</sup> the day before, says: ‘I cannot help being of opinion that our Irish friends are unreasonably tenacious. It seems to be quite forgotten that we have a jealous country and an active Opposition to

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

deal with—the former hurt at the idea of concessions to be repeatedly made at the expense of England; the other, actuated by revenge and avarice, ready to propagate every opinion that may tend to inflame the minds of the people and to take advantage of every local prejudice.'

In another 'Secret and Separate' letter<sup>1</sup> of the same date (April 15, 1785) to Orde, Lord Sydney guards himself from any misconception on the subject of parliamentary reform: 'In one of my official letters there dropped from me a couple of untoward epithets applied to parliamentary reform. They were the produce of my own mind, and certainly were not official expressions. One of the Cabinet hinted to me afterwards, but in perfect good humour, that in an official letter they might seem to convey the sentiments of the Cabinet on a subject on which I was not commissioned to write. The remark was fair.' The member of the Cabinet who made the objection was right, but the only definite meaning to be extracted from the oracular words of 'Tommy Townshend' is that the Cabinet did not wish then to commit themselves on the subject.

Pitt deemed it right to present the resolutions in an enlarged and remodelled form to the House of Commons on May 12, 1785, with a view to meeting objections taken in debate, and to insert amendments suggested in the discussions.

Orde, when he first saw them, thought that they would not be at all acceptable to Irish feeling, and that

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

his task in the Irish House of Commons would be rendered more difficult. He appears to have written<sup>1</sup> his impressions at once to his friend Rose on May 22, 1785, and expressed himself strongly against the permanent provision for the collection of the hereditary revenue. He says: ‘I am struck dead at the sight of it. But, for God’s sake, what is meant by it? What are the permanent provisions which you expect to be made for securing the due collection? If you mean the establishment of the regulations for the purpose which have been found necessary since the Acts of Customs and Excise, we may possibly be able to satisfy you on that head; but if you intend to call upon us to enact perpetually the Penal Statutes, founded chiefly upon the plan of summary proceedings under the Excise laws without a jury, and inflicting most severe pains and penalties, even to death, I repeat it again that nothing shall prevail upon any man here to be seen in support of it. I should have the honour of standing alone in making the proposition. It would not be seconded. . . . If this accursed notion of a *permanent* Revenue Bill had not been brought forward, we might have done well upon all the material points of your alterations, so far as it can be supposed that you really intended to carry them.’

Orde, in a letter the day following (May 23) to Pitt, expressed himself with much more moderation and cheerfulness. He said: ‘The great rage is, I find, occasioned chiefly by the fourth and eighteenth (re-

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.* Rutland had written to Pitt on the 19th on the subject. See *Rutland Correspondence*, 100.

solutions),<sup>1</sup> which seem to give to Great Britain the power of making laws for Ireland and to threaten the introduction of a perpetual Revenue Bill, either of which would create a most serious ferment in the nation. I am happy, however, to be able to qualify this account by assuring you that Beresford and Foster are good men and true (though both convinced of the impossibility of success in the eighteenth resolution if the permanent provisions are meant to extend to the *perpetuating* all the Penal Statutes now in force for the collection of the hereditary duties). . . . We shall not be discomfited by moderate difficulties, but we are all terrified at the permanent provisions.'

The following letter,<sup>2</sup> marked 'Secret,' of Pitt to Orde is a most powerful and vigorous exposure of the tactics of the Opposition in seeking to represent 'the independence of the Irish Legislature as infringed' by the resolution. It is indignant and resolute. He puts aside Orde's difficulties without a particle of hesitation, and almost loses patience with the objections made from

<sup>1</sup> The fourth resolution was as follows: 'That it is highly important to the general interests of the British Empire that the laws for regulating trade and navigation should be the same in Great Britain and Ireland; and therefore that it is essential towards carrying into effect the present settlement that all laws which have been made or shall be made in Great Britain for securing exclusive privileges to the ships and mariners of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Colonies, and for regulating and restraining the trade of the British Colonies, such laws, imposing the same restraints and conferring the same benefits on the subjects of both kingdoms, should be in force in Ireland by laws to be passed by the Parliament, for the same time and in the same manner as in Great Britain.' All the resolutions are set out fully in Plowden's *Ireland*, ii. 120; but the words of the fourth sufficiently show the grounds of the criticism applied.

<sup>2</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

Ireland as to forms, when the substance of the advantages was vital and the fact and extent of the contribution had been agreed upon :

[*Secret*]

24th May, 1785.

My dear Sir,—I am impatient to apprise you of what passed yesterday in the House of Commons, because it is plain from the whole conduct of the Opposition that nothing will be omitted on their part by misrepresentation and artifice to raise a jealousy and discontent in the Parliament, and still more, if they find it possible, in the people of Ireland, on the subject of a system which promises too much advantage to the whole Empire, if happily concluded, not to excite their utmost efforts to defeat it. The attempt now is to represent the Constitutional independence of the Irish Legislature as infringed by the proposed stipulation on their part to *adopt by their own authority in Ireland from time to time such laws as may be made in England for securing the British navigation and regulating the colony trade*. I trust that those who have been for months fomenting an opposition in this country to deprive Ireland of solid commercial advantages will not be heard with much credit and partiality in Ireland. After having been disappointed in their manœuvres here, they now attempt to make Ireland the dupe of their faction, and endeavour to prevent the completion of the arrangement by instilling groundless jealousies on Constitutional points which it in no shape affects. The opposition will not appear much the more respectable for having been led on by Lord Beauchamp. The ground they took was to represent the fourth proposition as stipulating a right in us to legislate for Ireland, though it was plain in the original tenor of the propositions, and made still more so by an amendment which we adopted to meet Mr. Foster's suggestion, that no law would be in force in Ireland but by the authority of the Irish Parliament, and that it was in fact only a voluntary compact by which that Parliament itself fixed the mode of exercising its own authority with a view to a particular object, and that in other parts of the compact the Parliament of this country just as much relinquishes its inde-

pendent authority by even so regulating and restraining the trade of our own colonies as to exclude Ireland from a full and absolute participation with ourselves.

The amendment moved by Lord Beauchamp was to leave out all the words in the fourth proposition (as it is standing in our printed copy), beginning with '*and that it is therefore essential,*' to the end of it, and then to proceed immediately to that part of the fifth proposition which begins: 'That all goods and commodities,' &c. This amendment, as we argued, did not even attain its pretended object, as it still necessarily left Ireland to adapt her duties from time to time on colony produce to the state of ours. It was, however, supported by the most inflammatory language, and the most insulting to the Irish Parliament. Mr. Sheridan stated in express terms that 'he should think it unfortunate if the Irish Parliament *dared* to pass those propositions'; that there had been appeals from the Parliament to the people. '*It was not by the Parliament that the independence of Ireland had been obtained, and it was not by them that it should be given up.*' Mr. Fox<sup>1</sup> argued in the same strain, but on its being stated to him that what was now stated to be so humiliating to Ireland was, as far as it relates to the colony trade, in fact a necessary condition voluntarily agreed to by themselves in order to enjoy that trade, and that they in fact now enjoy it by Lord North's Act expressly under a similar condition, he fairly acknowledged that to be the case, but they could now at any time get rid of the condition by waiving the benefit, whereas by this *permanent*

<sup>1</sup> Fox's speeches on May 12, 23, and 30, 1785, were very powerful. It is interesting and instructive to note the entirely different lines of argument used by Fox in the earlier and later debates on the resolutions. Thus, on February 22, 1785, he said: 'The whole tendency of the propositions appeared to go the length of appointing Ireland the sole guardian of the laws of navigation, and grand arbitress of all the commercial interests of the empire,' a trust which he felt no sort of inclination to part with out of our own hands. Then he referred to the extravagant length of concession to Ireland, and that 'he would trust everything to the generosity, but not much to the prudence of Ireland.' Later, when the eleven resolutions had been expanded into twenty, to meet English criticisms and objections, he loftily said 'he would not barter English commerce for Irish slavery.'

*settlement* neither the benefit nor the condition would cease but by mutual consent.

This was urged to be, what in truth it plainly was, an admission, if his argument meant anything, that there could never be any permanent settlement with Ireland, *consistent with the independence of their Legislature, which did not either resume the grant of the colony trade or annul the condition on which it was granted, which every Irishman has admitted to be reasonable and just*; and that consequently all his resolutions moved in 1782, and his declarations recently made of wishing well to a final settlement, were to be treated only as deceit and imposture. The whole tendency of this language is indeed too plain to be misunderstood. In fact, every man in the House, except the genuine offspring of Brooke's, was ashamed and afraid to countenance it. The consequence was that on the division there were 36 for the amendment and 194 against it. I send you a copy of the resolution as it now stands, with the amendments we agreed to, by which you will, I hope, find it accommodated to the ideas suggested in the letter I received from you. We did not think it necessary to particularise in the resolution the time within which the regulations in our laws should be enacted by the Parliament of Ireland, thinking that detail best left to the Act by which this settlement must be concluded.

It was, however, explained that the contents of any laws passed here could not be supposed to have any operation in Ireland till the sitting of the Irish Parliament had given them an opportunity to pass the Acts for the purpose. We have made use of the words 'the same benefits and restraints,' though not those of Mr. Yelverton's Act, because they seem safer and more explicit.

I have written this from the extreme anxiety that nothing on this great subject should be misunderstood, and I really trust to the good sense of leading men in Ireland that the incendiary attempts of opposition on this part of it will be felt and exposed as it ought. I must add, however, that while I am writing all this it is with a strong doubt on my mind whether all our views will not be finally disappointed. By your letter

to Rose, which came to me last night in the House, I find you still apprehend an impossibility of perpetuating the laws for collecting the hereditary revenues. I can add nothing to what I said on that subject in my last letter. I do not comprehend how any separation can be made of the regulations and the penalties. If you think any such thing can be done, I wish much to see as soon as possible the precise detail and mode of doing it. But I must say, melancholy as it is, that I entertain little hope of reaping now any further advantage from our long struggle than that of holding out to Ireland the whole of our system digested, the compliance of every article almost she has desired, accompanied only by provisions indispensable to our own security, and then leaving to her at last the option, with the whole before her, whether she will accept or reject it. Her refusal, or even her hesitation, will be injurious to herself and to the empire. But we can do no more, and we must wait with painful anxiety for the issue. I am impatient to hear still what is further said on the subject of friezes, muslins, etc. I believe there has been some mistake about it, and that they are burthened with duties which it is impossible to say were intended ; at least, what is stated as the ground seems to us not tenable, and I believe the best thing that we can do is to endeavour some way or other to leave this point open, that the detail of duties may be settled when the book of rates is compiled, only taking care that they shall, at all events, not exceed the lowest rate now subsisting in the two countries.

You shall not fail to hear, from time to time, every step in our progress, which I flatter myself will now be comparatively rapid.

Believe me to be, etc.,

W. Pitt.

The words of this letter are characteristic, clear, strong and resolute, the words of a man who was convinced that he was right and would stand no nonsense.

The correspondence of Pitt, Beresford and Rose from London with the Duke of Rutland and Orde in Dublin, during the months of June, July and August,

1785, shows how keenly everything was canvassed, and how disastrous were the efforts of the work of the Opposition in exciting and fomenting Irish jealousy and pride against the resolutions.

There were two points especially to which attention was directed. Pitt was clearly of opinion that there must in each country be identical laws<sup>1</sup> for trade, navigation and colonial commerce, and also that due provision should be made for the collection of the hereditary revenue. The hereditary revenue in Ireland consisted of certain duties levied on most goods imported, an excise duty upon articles of common consumption, and a hearth tax. It would appear to be scrupulously fair to select as Ireland's contribution the surplus of such a revenue, which would depend upon the exact proportion Ireland would benefit by the commercial advantages.

Pitt adhered resolutely to his plan throughout, hoping that Ireland would not be 'mad enough' to throw away all the advantages offered. The Duke of Rutland, Orde, and Beresford, alive to the flame that was being fanned in Ireland, were anxious to evade its force by keeping back the English resolutions, and to submit to the Irish Parliament a Bill the same as that introduced in

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Gladstone, in the House of Commons, in June 1893, stated: 'The United Kingdom, from geographical circumstances as well as from circumstances which were social and moral, constituted one great and vast trade circle. I base my position on this, that it was vital to the commerce of the three kingdoms that there should be uniformity of commercial law from one extremity of the land to the other.' In his *Special Aspects of the Irish Question* he also says: 'The views of Mr. Pitt for Ireland, as they were expressed in the year 1784 by his correspondence with the Duke of Rutland, were everything that equity and justice could suggest.'

England, and an Address which would be conciliatory. They said to the Cabinet—Keep the resolutions; be satisfied with the Address and Bill.

It would appear as if at the end the Irish Executive did not even see its way to doing more, in face of the outcry raised, than introduce the Bill at the close of the session, and then try what the next session would do.

The correspondence during these three months gives a vivid idea of the hopes and fears of those who were loyally anxious to carry to a successful adjustment the commercial arrangements of the two countries. The letters<sup>1</sup> of Pitt are conciliatory but resolute: *suaviter in modo, fortiter in re*:

Downing Street: June 15th, 1785.

My dear Sir,—I have seen Mr. Beresford, and have had some conversation with him. Some of the difficulties he states to me are new, and a good deal surprised me. I have, however, explained to him the outline of the ideas which loosely occurs to obviate them. There is no accommodation to opinion or prejudice, consistent with the real principle of our resolutions, which we shall not be ready to introduce into the Bill to facilitate the completion of this great business; but you should place your account to this, that from the substance of those resolutions we cannot depart, even though the risk should be that which, of all others, I think the greatest for both countries—that of throwing off the whole settlement till another year. I do not enter into any detail till I have explained farther with B., but send only these few words, as he tells me he is despatching a messenger.

W. Pitt.

Pitt to the Duke of Rutland:<sup>2</sup>

Downing Street: June 20th, 1785.

My dear Duke,— . . . I am really at a loss to know on what consistent ground an opposition can stand in Ireland to our

<sup>1</sup> Bolton MSS.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

fourth proposition. The uniformity of laws proposed to be stipulated seems rather to be a striking recognition than an infringement of the independence of Ireland. If the stipulation is agreed upon, it is their own act. They need not accept the settlement if they dislike the conditions annexed to it; but if they think it worth taking they bind themselves to what is necessary on their part, as any independent nation binds itself by treaty to another. . . .

I see the mischief (though I think it hardly a possible one) of the plan being madly rejected, or even postponed, by Ireland. The revival of the Volunteers, the renewal of every species of confusion, and a sort of commercial war between the two kingdoms, may be the consequence; but if the bent of Ireland should be too strong against the system, which is at least as much for their benefit as ours, I know no reason why this country should attempt to force it upon them. We do our part in holding it out for their acceptance; if they choose to reject it, they must judge for themselves. While I say this I feel, nevertheless, that every accommodation to smooth difficulties ought to be given on each side; without it such a settlement must be impossible, but I had rather it should fail totally for the present than that any of the essential objects should be compromised. If the friends of Ireland, and especially of British Government, are wise, they will not suffer it.

Yours, etc.,

W. Pitt.

Beresford's letters to Orde describing the proceedings in London are full of life and intelligence. His description of an important debate in the House of Lords is very graphic:

London: <sup>1</sup> 9th July, 1785.

My dear Sir,—Having yesterday at six o'clock discharged myself of that dead weight which hung upon my mind—the sending off to you the Bill—I have felt light ever since, and bore with the most Christian patience the very dullest debate I had ever the misfortune to endure, except a repetition of the

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*, Beresford to Orde.

very same from Sir Jno. Hort to Barré this morning, in which was compressed the whole essence of dulness contained in Lord Stormont's speech of two hours and a half, together with a very bad representation of Lords Camden, Thurlow, and Lansdowne. But I beg pardon. I forgot that you were, just at the moment when you receive this, reading the Bill on which depends the fate of nations. Read on. But, to enable you to judge, I am ordered by adverse fate to give you an account of last night's debate in the Lords, which I can truly give in these few words :—Question that the Chairman leave the chair. Ayes, 25 ; Noes, 58. This is the most favourable state of the debate, for it was very bad. Nobody, I believe, on either side, understood a sentence of the resolutions, and therefore no one spoke to the merits. The speakers were Lord Sydney, Lord Carlisle, Lord Coventry, Lord Dudley, Lord Walsingham, Lord Derby, who was the best on his side, very much. The first was worse than nothing ; the second indifferent ; third, a few words very well ; fourth spoke as well as he could for us, and voted against us, lest his neighbours should say he betrayed them ; the fifth very dull ; Lord Camden, a very pleasant piece of flowing language, much admired, but not satisfactory to any mind conversant with the subject ; Lord Stormont, hell and the devil, two hours and twenty minutes—I may well say devil, for there was not a man who had the misfortune to hear him who did not wish him a place *apud inferos*. Lord Lansdown answered him, or rather spoke after him ; he set out minutely well, got latterly into confusion, but was very well on the whole. He came purposely out of regard to the Duke and his secretary, and indeed he paid very handsome compliments to you both, and you are obliged to him. Lord Loughborough answered ; I understand him very unwell ; he was below himself ; argued nothing and dealt in quibbles. Then was an altercation with Lord Lansdown ; then came Lord Thurlow, who used his own tomahawk pretty freely ; he was the best, I think, by much, but still our business was not done justice to ; Lord Derby replied very bad ; Lord Stormont worse ; Lord King a few words on our side.

Question put and carried. Argument on our side. By-

standers near the Throne with us. This is all I can say ; particulars I refer to Woodfall. . . .

J. BERESFORD.

He was strong against the conduct of the Opposition, and in his letter <sup>1</sup> of July 12, 1785, to Orde he mentions : ‘Opposition <sup>2</sup> let out all their secrets as to Ireland, the Duke of P. (Portland) declared that he never had, when in Ireland, nor his noble friend deceased, the smallest idea of giving any commercial advantages (or conceding was the word) to Ireland : that had any such thing been in contemplation here, he would have had himself laid at His Majesty’s feet to implore leave to resign his situation, that he might not have been made an instrument in granting such capital disgrace, nay, such capital ruin upon the trade of England. These were his words, for which take care I am not quoted when the debates get over. Be sure his speech and Lord Stormont’s appear.’ He obviously only wanted the Bill through anyhow, and the substantial gain obtained for Ireland, and did not at all sympathise with the Cabinet’s not complying with the views of the Irish executive in favour of passing the English Bill, and against the resolutions being sent over. In his letter of July 20, 1785, to Orde, he says : ‘It is not yet determined ultimately how to proceed, but I have no doubt it will

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

<sup>2</sup> Sheridan took a brilliant part in the Opposition. Pulteney, writing to the Duke of Rutland in July 1785, says : ‘He entertained the House with the wittiest and most ingenious abuse of the resolutions that I yet heard or could conceive had at this time been left unsaid, and if Mr. Woodfall—who is bought by the Coalition—can do him justice, your grace will be entertained by so many ingenious whimsical illustrations.’ (*Hist. MSS. Com., Rutland Correspondence*, iii. 231.)

be put as we have settled heretofore. The same objections are now offered as to the absolute passing of the Bill, as I have already mentioned to you ; the answer to which is that if they are told from Ireland, that the passing the Bill, and not sending over the resolutions, is the most likely way of conciliating the country, why are they to put their argumentative speculations in opposition to facts stated, of which they are not competent to judge ? This has its due weight ; however, I am by no means certain of our ground in this particular, for doubtless it is a cavalier treatment, and liable to extensive argument.'

It was certainly very plain speaking, but Beresford was a shrewd, clear-headed Irishman, who felt he had a right to speak about Irish questions with authority.

The Duke of Rutland<sup>1</sup> did his best to smooth difficulties, and actually saw Grattan and told him of Pitt's disposition to modify 'as far as candour could require, those parts which were deemed exceptionable in Ireland.' He, however, reported that he found him 'impracticable in a degree scarcely credible,' and that he 'held firm in his opinion that anything except the eleven specific propositions as they went from Ireland was perfectly inadmissible.' This was clearly an impracticable attitude.

It is manifest that Beresford thought little of and suspected Pitt's colleagues :

London :<sup>2</sup> 23rd July, 1785.

My dear Sir,—The more I see the more I suspect that there is something rotten in the controlling powers : it is impossible,

<sup>1</sup> Rutland to Pitt, in July 1785 (*Rutland Correspondence*).

<sup>2</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

and it would be improper, for me to enter into particulars in a letter ; and, indeed, unnecessary also. I shall, therefore, delay to say more until I see you. Mr. Pitt deserves the thanks of Ireland, if every man got what he deserved.

Ever, etc.,

J. B.

To the Rt. Honble. Thos. Orde.

Rose, a sober Englishman, was afraid of delays. ‘The situation of Ireland,’ he says,<sup>1</sup> ‘would be perplexing to both Governments in a degree beyond all belief if no arrangements take place : the use she would then make of her independent Legislature under mad councils, which sober people would not be able to resist, would be ruinous to us and herself.’

Orde never wavered in his admiration for Pitt. ‘At all events,’ he writes:<sup>2</sup> ‘I am so sensible of the manly and noble part which Mr. Pitt has acted that I will die by inches in the cause of his support, convinced from my heart, as an Englishman, that you may safely agree to the essential points of accommodation which, as a temporary Irishman, I am obliged to forward to you.’

Orde also wrote a vigorous letter<sup>3</sup> to Beresford on the next day, again protesting against ‘the unexpected dilemma to which the late decision of the Cabinet has reduced us,’ stating that he had spent twelve hours with Lord Earlsfort (Clonmel) and Foster<sup>4</sup> upon the position, and that they had ‘a most decisive opinion that we could not hope for any safety whatever to the

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.* Letter to Orde, July 16, 1785.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* Letter to Rose, July 16, 1785.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* Orde to Beresford, July 27, 1785.

<sup>4</sup> Chancellor of the Exchequer in Ireland, afterwards Speaker.

plan of a settlement if the resolutions should be brought before the House of Commons,' that Parliament would not endure the resolutions without 'a strong motion expressive of reprobation of the fourth resolution, and some alteration of the words of it.' He proceeded: 'Great concern was expressed that the most unquestionable opportunity of success was thrown away, as there could have been no doubt of carrying a Bill here similar to the English Bill if Mr. Pitt had been able to effect his first purpose of passing it into an Act before we should have been called upon to take any step. . . . A determination not to pass the English Bill till Ireland should set the example would create insuperable jealousy and suspicion. It would be argued that this was a design to entrap this country a second time, and in a more serious way than on the first occasion. Resolutions were then, it would be said, adopted by Ireland as her own upon a supposition that they would be agreed to by Great Britain. It is now attempted to draw Ireland into a second snare by inducing her to pass a Bill by which she will engage to be contented with certain terms, and then who can ensure her against a total departure from them in the Bill which Great Britain is to pass? . . . For God's sake, try as a last effort to rescue us from the resolutions. The Address and the Bill will then not be thrown away, because they will serve as a proof of good intentions; but, coming here with the resolutions, they would with them be spurned at. . . . You are aware that I do not contend about the propriety and justice of such violence, but it is my duty to represent the almost inevitable event.'

Orde seems this month to have worked morning, noon and night on this question. A letter<sup>1</sup> from him to Rose is dated ‘30 p. 2 A.M., July 28, 1785,’ in which he says: ‘In one word, if the resolutions shall be sent to us we are ruined, unless we are allowed to withhold them from Parliament. It matters not that this may be unjust and unreasonable. The fact will so turn out.’

In another long letter<sup>2</sup> of the same date to Rose he says: ‘What happened to me yesterday! Lord Earlsfort and Foster, two of our firmest friends, declared the impossibility to admit the resolutions in the Journals without a stigma, which the just pride and honour of Great Britain could not endure. It is vain to argue upon the unreasonableness of this point. They are not to blame. Their sentiments of the real case may be the same as ours, but they dare not stand against a torrent which on such a question would bear us all away. Besides, this decision was so necessary that it cannot be accounted for but by a supposition of a fixed design to overthrow the whole plan, and to make the Irish Government the contemptible instruments of it. I again repeat my conviction that we had secured for you a moral certainty of success. I hardly say too much now, when I apprise you of as great a certainty of defeat, unless you can yet keep back the accursed resolutions and suffer us to proceed in our own way. . . . At present it is decided by these gentlemen (politicians) that either we are given up by Mr. Pitt and his friends, or that he is forsaken by them, the consequence of either of which ideas is the same. Those, indeed, who judge most from

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

appearances form another conjecture very much to our disadvantage, and suppose that we are combined with our friends on the other side to deceive the friends of Government here. . . . Do not imagine that I justify these rash proceedings here. They are most unwarrantable, and I have almost worn out my lungs in declaring and arguing against them. But I must freely own that after what has passed we ought not to have heard of the resolutions.'

In a letter<sup>1</sup> to Beresford of the same date Orde says : 'I am, however, at the same time, cut to the heart with the unreasonable repugnance to admit these resolutions, which the Parliament of Great Britain has condescended to explain in a manner so flattering and conciliatory to Ireland. . . . Our friends have conceived notions of diffidence in Mr. Pitt's power over his Cabinet, and are very suspicious of designs in some to defeat the measure entirely.'

These suspicions were to some extent shared by Beresford and Orde. Beresford, in a 'most private' letter, alludes mysteriously to suspicions he entertained, and was replied to by Orde in a letter dated 'Thursday morning, 2 A.M.,' and saying : 'I am strongly inclined to suspect, as you do, and yet it is very extraordinary. We, however, have done our duty, and it will not be our fault if all does not go well. Mr. Pitt deserves all our praise, and it is secure to him here, but my suspicion is now strengthened of the good intentions of some of his colleagues.'

Pitt kept calmly on his course: he had complete

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

confidence in himself and in the justice and propriety of his action. He had fought the battle of the resolutions openly, and in the face of day. He had only insisted on what he thought was really essential, and although willing to present the points in a conciliatory form, he had no intention of receding from the substance. He was resolute against any attempt to ‘fritter down’ under colour of making ‘more palatable,’ and he was clear that any effort to ‘blink or disguise’ a fundamental point would be as ruinous as it would be disgraceful.<sup>1</sup> His letters are perfectly calm and courteous :

Downing Street :<sup>2</sup> Aug. 3rd, 1785.

My dear Sir,—I felt more pleasure than I can express in your letter received yesterday, especially after the contents of the former. The substantial difficulties are, I trust, so far overcome that a continuance of address and exertion will secure the rest. Be assured that we all most truly and cordially wish to adopt every expedient that can smooth your labours. I wish it were possible to do so in the point of not transmitting the resolutions. But you will already have learnt from B. that we have thought it quite impracticable. I trust the effect of the Address (accompanying as it will be by the Bill, which we have laboured to make as fully in the same spirit) will make this point of less importance, especially as, perhaps, the entering the resolutions on the Journals may be unnecessary. The eleven Irish resolutions will not appear in ours, and if the same thing can be silently managed with you, it will be very well. Any direct question against entering them must, to be sure, be resisted as an affront, and indeed will now, I think, hardly be attempted. The plan you propose for your proceedings seems unexceptionable. The fortnight’s adjournment will, I think, be useful for giving time for our Address and Bill to be circu-

<sup>1</sup> *Rutland Correspondence.* Pitt to Rutland, August 8, 1785.

<sup>2</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

lated, and to operate in the country. Your examinations at the Bar will, I hope, be short; but I am sure, from our experience, that they ought to have a free scope given to them. On the whole, I trust we are now nearly on certain ground. We have done all that seemed to us possible to be done to send the business finally from hence in the most conciliatory shape, and I am sure you will agree that it is now equally necessary to give an impression of our firmness in adhering to it. . . . I mean to write to the Duke on a thousand subjects which I have been obliged to postpone, as soon as I get into the West.

W. P.

Rose, writing to Orde on August 7, says that Pitt did not think it possible to admit of any alteration in the Irish Bill respecting the unity of navigation and trade laws, ‘which is the only subject of any importance about which you express anxiety,’ and adds: ‘With respect to a resolution asserting the absolute independence of your Legislature for both external and internal purposes, commercial and political, etc., or any other nonsense Mr. Flood can invent, there can be no possible objection to it from hence, but you may judge whether he may not tack somewhat to your resolutions which may be mischievous.’

Pitt showed no sign of weakness, and in the following letter to Orde<sup>1</sup> used the language of courage and determination :

Burton Pynsent : Aug. 8, 1785.

My dear Sir,—I was just preparing to write a few lines to you when I received, by a messenger from Rose, your letter of the 3rd. I trust the Bill, in the shape you will receive it, can occasion no difficulties. I hope it the more anxiously because I

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

can conceive none which can be removed. We have taken infinite pains to put everything, and particularly what relates to the fourth proposition, in the light most unexceptionable and most flattering to the feelings of Ireland. The principle of a necessary uniformity of navigation laws is admitted. The Bill, in order to obtain it, stipulates that all the laws to be made by Great Britain shall confer equal benefits, etc., and that Ireland shall enact laws to do the same there. Our legislative rights are surely as much bound as yours, and Ireland, instead of having to *register* edicts, will have always as free a judgment as England whether the laws in fact are equal. To blink in any respect so fundamental a point can answer no good purpose. It would betray a weakness enough to ruin our cause at present, or, if not, must leave all the settlement in constant hazard hereafter. I will not, however, plague you by discussion, for I am sure I can give you no better arguments than will suggest themselves to you. I must, however, distinctly apprise you that on this point there does not exist in the mind of any man here the possibility of relaxation. On the subject of the hereditary revenue, we have modelled our Bill in the way most likely to please, that is, as generally as possible. It is essential that your preamble should not omit the words *in time of peace* in the sentence which speaks of the propriety of providing towards defraying, etc., the necessary expenses of the empire. It is also essential to enact as a *principle* that all laws for the collection of additional duties *should be applicable to the hereditary revenue*, and, in case the additional duties cease, either the same laws, from time to time, or others equally effectual. We have inserted in our Bill (with some risk) the exceptions for rum, linens, and provisions, as far as relates to duties. The idea of Ireland giving a bounty to the Colonies where we do not cannot go down, and it would be useless. For if it is worth while for Ireland to give a bounty on the export of her linens it will be worth our while to do so that they may go through this country. I hope your health will support itself through the remainder of this arduous task. My motion for bringing in the Bill was not expressly grounded on the resolutions, but was in general words 'for finally settling, etc.,' as appears in the

title. I fear my letter can hardly reach you before Thursday, but I take my chance. An answer to your address is now out of the question, and I think would be liable to some risk, for a reason that Rose has assigned to you.

W. P.

The result is well known. Orde asked leave to introduce a Bill into the Irish House of Commons embodying the items of the adjustment, and he did so in a clear, able and conciliatory speech. He was strongly opposed, and it was obvious from the start that his opponents were numerous and sanguine. Grattan made a long, eloquent and impassioned speech,<sup>1</sup> never once, however, seriously grappling with the arguments of Pitt or realising his standpoint. He demanded that the Irish Parliament might be trusted to do what was right, and that experience had not shown that they could not be relied on. But in matters of important private contract, no matter how true the trust, common sense always requires the agreement to be put into formal shape. In treaties between nations, no matter how closely allied, the form of the arrangement is always most elaborately reduced to writing. So in the case of this Bill : it was not a question of distrust, but one of ordinary prudence, to have a clear

<sup>1</sup> Woodfall, the Parliamentary reporter, says : 'He said some of the finest things in the newest mode ;' and the Viceroy, in his letter to Pitt, August 13, 1785 (*Rutland Correspondence*), says : 'The speech of Mr. Grattan was, I understand, a display of the most beautiful eloquence perhaps ever heard, but it was seditious and inflammatory to a degree hardly credible.' Grattan had a generous though rather inflated way of praising the oratory of his friends. Thus he described Yelverton's speech on the Catholic claims in 1782 : 'It was the march of an elephant, it was a wave of the Atlantic, a column of water 3,000 feet high' (*Irish Quarterly Review*, iv. 108).

statutable contract for the collection of the hereditary revenue, and for an identical code of laws which would prevail in each country in relation to the great commerce which was now to become a common subject matter. Of course, like all contracts, it might be broken, and there was nothing in the Bill proposed by Orde which did or could take away from the Irish Parliament the power of breaking the contract and dissolving the agreement. Grattan's appeal to experience was idle. But three years had passed since 1782—the only time within which there could have been experience—and even if a longer time had elapsed that would not have induced Pitt to leave this great part of the arrangement in a loose and unsettled state. Grattan was entirely sincere. He felt that he himself could be trusted not knowingly to abuse any of the new powers acquired in 1782, and this indeed he showed more than once in subsequent years.<sup>1</sup>

Curran also made a violent speech, in which he said : ‘We may ratify our own infamy. We cannot ratify our own slavery, and I shall vote against the Bill, as leading to a schism between the two nations that must terminate in a civil war, or in a union at best.’ The rejection of the Bill might give, and did in fact supply,

<sup>1</sup> When on February 5, 1794, Sir L. Parsons moved, in the Irish House of Commons, for copies of several conventions and treaties which had been laid before the British Parliament relative to the great war then going on, Grattan opposed it as ‘an artificial motion to bring into debate objections against the war—an artificial argument to interest the pride of the Assembly in the abuse of an unquestionable privilege, which it proposed to abuse in order to assert.’ Some of Grattan’s supporters, in resisting the Bill proposed by Orde, may also be said to have been influenced by an ‘artificial argument to influence the pride of the Assembly.’

an argument for the union. It is hard to see how its enactment could be so used. But the Bill in the debate was treated more as a matter of sentiment, feeling, nationalism, than of argument. The declamation of Fox at Westminster had done its work, and Orde had only a majority of nineteen when the division was taken. This was accepted as amounting practically to a defeat, and Orde proceeded no further. The result was regarded as a triumph to Irish ideas, and Dublin was illuminated. On August 13, 1785, the Lord-Lieutenant wrote an account of the defeat to Pitt, who replied,<sup>1</sup> August 17, 1785, calmly and with dignity :

My dear Duke,—I confess myself not a little disappointed and hurt on your account, by your letter and Mr. Orde's of the event of Friday. I had hoped that neither prejudice nor party could on such an occasion have made so many proselytes against the true interests of the country, but the die seems in a great measure to be cast, at least for the present. Whatever it leads to, we have the satisfaction of having proposed a system which I believe will not be discredited even by its failure, and we must wait times and seasons for carrying it into effect. . . . It is still almost incomprehensible to me who can have been the deserters who reduced our force so low, and wait with great impatience for a more particular account. All I have to say in the meantime is very short; let us meet what has happened with the coolness and determination of persons who may be defeated but cannot be disgraced, and who know that those who obstruct them are greater sufferers than themselves. . . . Our cause is on too firm a rock here to be materially shaken, even for the time, by this disappointment, and when the experience of this fact has produced a little more wisdom in Ireland I believe the time will yet come when we shall see all our views realised in both countries and for the advantage of both. It

<sup>1</sup> *Rutland Correspondence*, p. 117.

may be sooner or later, as accident or perhaps (for some time) as malice may direct, but it will be right at last. We must spare no human exertion to bring forward the movement as early as possible, but we must be prepared also to wait for it on one uniform and resolute ground, be it ever so late. . . .

Believe me ever your most affectionate and faithful friend,  
W. Pitt.

The Duke of Rutland deemed it right to send Cooke to London to explain fully everything in person to Pitt. Flood, on the 15th, in order to emphasise and place on record the feelings of the Opposition, brought forward a motion for the purpose of declaring ‘the four propositions as passed in the Parliament of Great Britain as destructive of the liberties and Constitution of Ireland.’ Orde managed the difficulty by postponing the whole matter; and the following was Pitt’s letter<sup>1</sup> to Orde when apprised of what had occurred :

Putney Heath : Saturday, Aug. 20, 1785.

My dear Sir,—Your account of the proceedings of Monday, 15th, reached me yesterday. Comparing the event with what had preceded, I can most heartily congratulate you upon it. Nothing, I think, could be wiser than the decision of postponing the business, or the tone in which it was announced. I apprehend a prorogation should clearly follow, and we had anticipated that opinion even before yesterday’s account.

Flood’s having been obliged to withdraw his motion is, under such circumstances, a victory. The future measures should depend altogether on the temper of the nation. At the same time, I need hardly say that every exertion should be made to encourage the leading interest in all parts of the kingdom, both to make the people understand their true interests and to prevent the manœuvres of opposition from raising any present ferment among the remains of the Volunteers or the body of the

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*

people. It will probably not be prudent to press for any public declarations in favour of the plan till there has been time for the prejudice to subside, and for the subject to be more fully understood. In the meanwhile, it is enough to stand on the defensive. I am very far from despairing that the nation may ere long see its true interests ; and at all events I shall reflect with satisfaction on the attempt made to promote it, as well as on the firm and zealous support of the true friends of both countries. The merit of their conduct is great in itself, and not a little heightened by the contrast which the times have afforded. I have no doubt that perseverance and good faith on the part of Government and its supporters will yet efface the effects of that disgraceful policy which has in some late Administrations prevailed in Ireland, and to which most of the difficulties of the present moment are to be ascribed.

Pray make my affectionate compliments to the Duke, and be so good as to express to the friends you particularly mentioned how warmly their conduct is felt here.

The time of prorogation must, I imagine, be regulated by the interest necessary for passing the Bills depending. Our Parliament will not meet till after Christmas.

W. Pitt.

Thus, very early, a great difference in a matter of imperial concern had arisen between the English and Irish Parliaments. It was caused by playing upon the warm and patriotic feelings of the popular party in Ireland. The acceptance of the Bill would have been wiser, and more in accordance with the true and obvious interests of Ireland. In substance it was clearly for the benefit of the country. The main objections were to forms, and rested, as was said in the correspondence, on a ‘punctilio’ and on a ‘phantom.’ To deliberately cause a miscarriage of this great arrangement was factious and wrong, and the statesmanship of those who are responsible must in this important

matter be gravely impugned. Mr. Morley,<sup>1</sup> in his judicial summing up, says that the course of the Opposition was factious, and as Burke followed Fox as his leader he found it hard to vindicate him from the ‘charge of factiousness.’ ‘For once he allowed his political integrity to be bewildered.’

<sup>1</sup> *Burke*, by John Morley.





180. A. M. 22

Walker & Bowdell, publ.

*"The Great Commoner."*

## CHAPTER V

## PITT'S MOTHER AND ELDEST BROTHER

Pitt's love for his family—His brother—His sisters—Bishop Tomline preserved some family papers—Lady Chatham's letters to Pitt—Long gap in them—Her letters to Eliot—To Mr. Wilson—Seven of her letters to Mr. Wilson—Three to Eliot—Letters to Mr. Wilson referring to Pitt—Pitt to his mother—Lady Chatham to Pitt—To her two sons—To Pitt—Duel with Tierney—Pitt's account to his mother—Of his brother's military conduct—Lady Chatham to Pitt—The second Lord Chatham—First Lord of Admiralty—Pitt thought a change desirable—To make Lord Spencer First Lord—And to transfer his brother to post of Lord Privy Seal—Lord Eldon's high estimate of second Lord Chatham—Four letters from Pitt to Chatham—and four from Chatham to Pitt—The brothers continued on most affectionate terms—Incident showing how Pitt could subordinate family feelings—Embarrassment of Pitt's finances—Advances to his brother may partly account—His brother gets the Garter.

PITT was a man with strong family feelings and a great sense of duty to his own nearest relations.

He was the best of sons, and a kind and affectionate brother. His correspondence with his father has been already referred to, and Lord Stanhope's volumes show how steadily and how loyally he maintained his correspondence with his mother. His two sisters died in the prime of their youth. Lady Hester seems to have been a woman of ability—highly educated, and with many social gifts. Lady Harriot was the youngest of the family, and it may be inferred from all the corre-

spondence that Pitt was greatly attached to her. She married his own great friend Eliot, and she lived and died (1786) in his house, leaving one little girl, who was reared by his mother, and to whom he was bound by all the ties of near blood and constant companionship.

Lord Stanhope, in his preface, says that the Bishop of Lincoln appeared to have destroyed nearly all the letters addressed to Pitt by members of his family, and that among those in the collection there was not one from his mother, from either of his sisters, or from either of his brothers, until the time when his eldest brother became his Cabinet colleague. The Bishop did not, however, destroy all these family letters, for he would appear to have preserved some of them, most probably with a view of publishing them in the further volume of Pitt's biography in which he contemplated dealing with family and personal matters.

I have been fortunate enough to find in the 'Prettyman MSS.' several letters of Lady Chatham to Pitt (with, however, a great gap between 1775 and 1794), and also a close series of letters from her to her son-in-law Eliot (1786 to 1794), mainly about his daughter and her progress and health, but with some references to her son William. I have also found some interesting correspondence between the brothers, which I have used in their proper places in this book. The correspondence of Lady Chatham with the Rev. Mr. Wilson, already referred to, comprises letters of deep interest from 1766 to 1798. The following letters of Lady

Chatham speak for themselves. The first seven<sup>1</sup> are addressed to Mr. Wilson, and are specially interesting on account of the references they contain to Pitt :

Burton Pynsent: Feb. 2, 1784.

My dear Sir,—.... The sense of many a past glorious conflict, the astonishing renewal of the same noble spirit, and honourable effects from the exertion of it, fill my thoughts with a satisfaction that needs no defining to you, who have rejoiced in the glories of the father, and have a right to so touching a share in those of the son. The rough and rude attacks made upon William have happily only served to show how equal he is in every superior quality to that important situation to which he has been so honourably call'd, and in which he wou'd be continued if the general voice of the people prevailed. He is therefore much obliged to his enemies for having brought him to so sharp a trial. I can never to myself seem half thankful enough to the Supreme Being for having bless'd him with health to resist such a load of anxious business without yielding under the pressure of it. As much delighted as I have been with all and every part of his conduct, I have never allow'd myself to break in upon his time by sending him a letter to read which wou'd only have told him what he was perfectly sure was in his mother's heart and soul. The subject I was most tempted to write upon was to beg him, and enjoin him, to be careful of his health ; but the eagerness of the time could leave little respite in his power, so I gave up the thought of it, and trusted that a gracious Providence wou'd take care of him. By the time this reaches you the great business will be decided of Coalition or not. Much might be said upon that point, but a great deal is necessary to be known to say anything properly upon it, and nothing by the post can be right; so I shall conclude that matter, for the decision of which I shall wait with infinite impatience. I hope the Septuagint will agree in thinking it expedient that the Powers that be shou'd be supported. I

<sup>1</sup> *The Stanhope Papers.*

admire Mr. Gloucester's having found so good an appellation for the St. Albans meeting. . . .

Your affectionate and faithful friend,  
HESTER CHATHAM.

Burton Pynsent : Feb. 25, 1784.

Dear Sir,—Any pleasure or satisfaction my last letter can have given you, yours of the 13th has most amply repaid. When the post arrived after my last writ to you, I always said to myself there is no good news—I hear nothing from Mr. Wilson; by which you will understand I continued for some time to believe you still in town listening to our young man, and had no idea of your excellent employment. I congratulate you on the flattering consequences that followed, and am delighted in figuring in my mind a scene so very touchingly pleasing to affectionate friends, whose love and attachment for my late noble lord were so zealously transmitted by them to his (I must say it) unequalled son. I read the whole account of what past at the meeting with the most entire satisfaction, and I approved and admired highly a speech of a Rev. Mr. Wilson, whose political sentiments were express with a manly clearness, and his favourable testimony of the hero of the day, delivered in the tenderest manner. When I had finished every part, ‘Berkshire for ever’ was the natural thing that occurred, and which of course I said. I am indeed more pleased with the whole together of what pass'd than with the proceedings of any other county meeting that I, at least, have heard the account of. Last night’s post brought me a most agreeable letter from Doctor Addington, writ with that warmth of heart which his feelings on the occasion so easily inspired. Nothing is more strikingly triumphant for the present Ministry than the stile of the address, and the resolutions of the thanks, leaving out the non-deservers. I am persuaded the example of what was done by so numerous a body of respectable freeholders will prove a very useful one in various ways. . . .

Your affectionate, humble servant,  
HESTER CHATHAM.

Burton Pynsent: Nov. 2, 1784.

My dear Sir,—. . . . What you tell me of the satisfaction received from our young Minister's paying his duty at Windsor conveys what makes me very happy, as allowing a confidence to be taken that the earnest zeal for serving the great person in question and advancing the prosperity of the country will be rendered effectual by favour and support. The health and spirits which I hear from everybody my son enjoys, and which you have so kindly confirm'd, persuades me that he must feel easy and happy. I am sure that you can be a judge for me of the importance such a persuasion is to my peace and happiness, as I am certain your own will be increased by it, and that the retreat of each will be much improved by reflecting upon it. I must have some little doubt how Binfield can have a right to be called a sequester'd retirement. Burton, indeed, may claim that character, secluded as it is from the grand world. I expect, however, in the course of this month, that it will be so far a place of public consequence as being publicly talked of from my son's visit to it. He stands engaged to come to me, and I hope it will be put into his power to perform his engagement. I have lived a long time upon the pleasure of expecting him, and if he comes I shall live a long time after upon the pleasure of having seen him. His company will make everything cheerful round us, tho' Winter is beginning his approaches. However, we have still leaves and verdure beyond what is common for the season, as if they prolonged their continuance for his reception. I do really flatter myself that unless there shou'd be business of extraordinary consequence he will obtain the gracious permission of performing his promise to his mother.

I am, dear sir,  
Your affectionate friend and very humble servant,  
HESTER CHATHAM.

Burton Pynsent: January 1, 1785.

The delightful scene you found at Hollywood Hill leaves an impression of satisfaction and happiness that is still felt most sensibly. If I was to tell you all my thoughts and all my joy, from the lively description you give me of the *whole* that

fill'd your imagination from what you saw of my dear William in his retreat, I shou'd only give you back your own thoughts and your own joy, for I do truly think, my dear sir, *I* cannot feel more happiness upon this subject than you do. I am very glad you like the situation. It is indeed much better for the purpose of courting retired leisure, and enjoying some relaxation from business, than Putney. Now he can insure a like time to himself to think of his friends and of his affairs. I don't love to consider the last for him, for reasons that I too well know affect them, from my own situation at times. If proofs of affection in some cases did not create regrets, nothing could go beyond what I feel in consequence of those I have continually received from him. You know he is the same perfect creature in all respects, and therefore will not wonder that he shou'd be the most amiable of sons. I live in hopes of seeing him before the grand business of Parliament begins. Yet I have so many fears about his coming that I change my opinion and wish often, lest any distress shou'd happen in his short absence. . . .

Your affectionate and humble servant,  
HESTER CHATHAM.

Burton Pynsent: March 19, 1785.

Dear Sir, —. . . What infinite happiness that my young great man should have stood this most rigorous season without suffering more from it than a common cold, and that that shou'd have gone off so kindly, without preventing him longer from using his persuasive voice. I cou'd not help a thousand tears about it, tho' Harriot was very attentive in giving me continual accounts of him that *ought* to have been satisfactory. His not making me his intended visit alter'd extremely the whole cast of the winter to me, for it would have secured me a foundation of pleasure that wou'd have carried me more agreeably through it: but it wou'd not have been right so late in the season to have had it take place. I have great comfort from the circumstance of Harriot's being so agreeably establish'd with her brother for the present, but I could not have her continue long without engaging in a union of another sort, which

I hope there is no reason to think will be the case, all things considered as to the mind of the lady, and situation. As to his honour, Mr. Pitt himself, he has not leisure to think of such engagements, which I am the more easy about because I cannot help supposing that he may with success where ever he pleases. . . .

Your affectionate friend,

HESTER CHATHAM.

Burton Pynsent : Tuesday, April 1785.

. . . That 'old experience' of thine has given me many an anxious moment since I writ last to you, seeing how easy it was by the arts of misrepresentation to give an alarm upon the Irish propositions, on which so few people are qualified to be perfect judges. I feel more at ease upon the success now than I did, and I have the most heart-felt satisfaction in the contemplation of that honorable and honest spirit with which our Sully has gone forward in the business, leaving the consequence it might have upon his situation as *Minister* quite out of the question. I have so often admired the same conduct in the dear father that I must rejoice undoubtedly to see it in the son I love in the degree he merits to be loved. The conversation which you was indulged with respecting my family makes me vain for them ; for besides the honor of inquiry, you will have given them praise (with a heart of affection) that must have excited admiration of them. I enjoy so many *present* blessings that I must not permit myself to speak of what occurs of regret. Without it you will know what must pass in my mind for those I have lost. I am not acquainted with Doctor Majendie, but I am persuaded William wou'd never hesitate a moment upon such an occasion in doing what was agreeable to the wishes of his master. I take for granted you will have heard of the great honor done Harriot in the commands of Her Majesty, at different times, to attend of an evening at Buckingham House. It is a very flattering distinction, which is properly felt. Great as the honor is, those parties are not always pleasure, but in this case the last was joined, and Harriot is really, if I may take the liberty to use the expression, in love with the Princess.

Your most faithfull and affectionate,

HESTER CHATHAM.

Burton Pynsent : July 8, 1785.

My dear Sir,—. . . . Some thoughts now and then of the disagreeable turn about the Shop Tax, and the delays introduced to retard the conclusion of the Irish business, so highly important, will intrude themselves in these peaceful scenes, but I exchange them as soon as possible for the happy ones of my dear William's success with his country and his Maker. It is to me amazing how he has had the powers to go through such contention as he has done on every point of difficult business, with his temper tried as it must have been by knowing that those who opposed him knew that their arguments were false and unfounded, which made it more piquing. I am obliged to you for your kind wishes about the grant, which was settled as you imagin'd. It pass'd very pleasingly for my son and myself, the Opposition having given (as I understand) some agreeable "Hear him's" when he named it in his modest manner, as being so nearly concern'd in it that he felt distressed from having it to propose. . . .

Yours with all sincerity and friendship,  
HESTER CHATHAM.

The next three letters are to her son-in-law Eliot :

Burton Pynsent : May 16, 1787.

My dear Mr. Eliot,—I have a particular pleasure in resuming my claim of writing to you this morning, because I have been furnished by a visit from Doctor Warren, whom I saw a couple of days ago, with something you will like to hear, tho' to a certain degree it is a sort of repetition. He went, as he never fails when he comes here, to pay his court to sweet child, and she captivated him so much by all her little ways, and by choosing to stay with him, that he was quite in raptures with her ; and when he came back he assured me without any compliment, *as he said*, that she was altogether the *handsomest*, as well as the *healthiest* child of her age he had ever seen. . . . I am made extremely happy by your account of dear William. The blessing of his health being continued to him, through such a variety of trying occurrences, is unspeakable ; and wonderful it

also is that all the difficulties that present themselves seem only to rise, as it were, to add an increase of honour to him. I have been frequently intending to write to him to tell him how much his successes influence my feelings in the points most sensible to me, but then I think, having the *honor* to be his mother, I need not engage any of his time to read what he beforehand knows. Newmarket is not enough in favour with me not for me to be glad that my dear son Chatham is returned from thence. . . .

I remain ever, my dear son,

Your truly affectionate mother,

H. CH.

Burton Pynsent : October 31, 1787.

My dear Mr. Eliot,—. . . I unwillingly take up a subject which yet I cannot help saying a few words upon ; and that is the distressing news<sup>1</sup> from Ireland, which you will have heard before this time. You will participate with me in many anxious feelings on the event. My son William writ to me to impart himself the afflicting event to me. It was a great comfort to me to receive a letter from him, knowing the weight of a loss that friendship, as well as many important reasons besides, must render heavy. He has been told by the poor *Duke's agent* that he is left one of the executors and guardians to his children. A flattering mark, but which, I doubt, must bring too much trouble with it for me to feel very glad of it. . . .

I am ever, my dear son,

Your most truly affectionate mother,

H. CH.

The evening has brought me the assurance of peace being settled from dear William's own hand. I congratulate you.

Burton Pynsent : Saturday, July 18, 1789.

You have perfectly answer'd, my dear Mr. Eliot, the trust I had that you wou'd be so good to send me an account of all particulars of the state of this mortifying gout, which made the attack, as I imagine, quite unexpectedly, because, by all I had of my dear William's health, he cou'd have suffer'd no previous

<sup>1</sup> The death of the Duke of Rutland.

sickness, to give an intimation of its intention. His writing me word of the circumstance himself was the kindest and best preservative possible against my being alarm'd. You will have found, from my letter to him, that his caution had had the propos'd effect, and that I was not *more* than very sorry for the unpleasing news. Unpleasing as it was, I still felt a joy from seeing his hand. Thank God, it appears by your history of the course it has gone on in that the attack has been of the most favourable and wholesome sort, and I am quite happy with his having yielded to the prudent advice of not putting on a shoe whilst there was remaining tenderness in his foot. I cannot but hope that he did not suffer himself to be tempted to go out yesterday, and I flatter myself that there can be no call for his doing it of a Saturday. His having quiet for two or three days to allow time for the swelling to go down entirely will be a great security against the danger of a return.

I shou'd think, according to the opinion exprest by Mr. Fox (or at least that the newspapers make his) of the people's present *infatuation*, that he means to decline, for this session at least, all further opposition. Indeed, from both what you and my son have said, the *battle* seems over for this campaign. I admire extremely Mr. Secretary Grenville's speech. No intelligence can I get, directly, of Lord Buckingham, or the Marchioness. What to conclude I don't know. Mrs. Stapleton writ to the last, in my name, as well as her own, with all proper expressions, upon various apposite events, and our hopes that the neighbourhood of Bath might be the means of our having a glance at them. Not a word in return hitherto. Poor Jacob is starving in Wales, expecting the issue of my application. It is very disagreeable to me. How many times have you said to yourself, how long will she go on before she mentions my dear girl? I have reserved her this time for the *bonne bouche*. She is as well as when Mrs. Stapleton writ Thursday, and that was as well as possible. . . . She says she is very glad Uncle Pitt is coming, and that she shall know him; but she don't think he will know her, as she is grown so *great*. . . .

I remain, my dear son,

Your very truly affectionate mother,

H. CH.

All the time her correspondence with Mr. Wilson went on—full of her son. On October 11, 1791, from Burton Pynsent, she wrote : ‘ There can be no occasion for me to tell you the supreme happiness I enjoyed from seeing my dear son William in the best looks and the best health imaginable all the time he was here. He was to have returned to us in about ten days from Weymouth, but the unexpected early time fixed for the Duke of York’s marriage carried him to London, and he picked up some gout, which, however, thank God, proved very slight and ended soon.’

Writing in 1793, she alludes to ‘ the ease and gay spirits of her dear son William.’ In a later letter she says : ‘ He did not look like a man charged, as one may say, with the fate of kingdoms, but quite at his ease. The uprightness of his intentions and the strength of his mind saved him from feeling any oppression from the weight upon him.’

Then comes the following letter from Pitt to his mother, showing how he was always anxious to let her see he encouraged her being interested in public affairs :

Downing Street : July 31, 1793.

My dear Mother,—The happy account of the surrender of Mayence has been followed very quick by similar good news from Valenciennes, which arrived this morning. There are still one or two interesting events for which I must wait, and it will not be possible for me to be absent on August 12, which will probably be celebrated as the Prince’s birthday. I am in hopes nothing will put off my journey westward longer than to-morrow or Friday fortnight.

Ever, my dear mother,

Your dutiful and affectionate,

W. Pitt.

The following letter shows the ready and generous way in which Pitt was always ready to assist his mother:

Downing Street : Nov. 11, 1793.

My dear Mother,—I trust I need not say that my first wish must always be to contribute to your ease and convenience, and I am only sorry you should have given yourself so much trouble where a single word would have been sufficient. I can furnish, without difficulty, three hundred pounds, and will immediately desire Mr. Coutts to place that sum to your account. Indeed, I should not feel satisfied with myself in not naming at once a larger sum if it were not that my accession of income has hitherto found so much employment in the discharge of former arrears as to have no very large fund which I can, with propriety, dispose of. This, however, will mend every day, and, at all events, I trust you will never scruple to tell me when you have the slightest occasion for any aid that I can supply. I was fearful that poor Hester would not be indulged with staying much longer, but I had not heard that she had actually left you. The melancholy account of Lord Montague and Mr. Burdett, I am sorry to say, is true, and they were both, as I understand, to have married in Mr. Coutts' family.

We have no news but in the enclosed 'Gazette,' which contains accounts from L——, not very recent, but, as far as they go, very satisfactory.

Ever, my dear mother,

Your dutiful and affectionate,

W. Pitt.

Burton Pynsent : Feb. 27, 1794.

My dear Son,—This letter is, I assure you, not intended to give you any repetition of *my expression* on your subject in that which I writ to Mr. Eliot. It is no time for the pleasure of indulging the saying what my different feelings and wishes are about you, as you are *pretty well* acquainted with them already, and would only break in upon your continual employment of business.

I have had this morning an application from a sort of old

acquaintance of yours at Taunton, by name *Foy*, and I have agreed to lay his request before you. I was the more ready to be prevailed upon to do so because that town is in a state that makes me glad to encourage the well disposed, and I believe he is now really so, and hates the infernals (as he calls the French) with the greatest aversion. His humble petition is in favour of Mr. Thomas Foy, his nephew, who is about thirty years old, and who has been fourteen or fifteen years in the army. He served three years in Jamaica in the 60th Regiment, and then returned to Taunton and went into the 94th, in which he now remains lieutenant on half pay, and lives at Taunton. His desire is that as there are to be barracks there, and that the ground is already marked out for that purpose, he may be appointed barrack-master when it is proper. Now you know the whole, and will decide about it as you shall judge best. Let me hear by *your secretary* what you shall or shall not do about it, and I will let Foy know. I imagine it will be done by Sir George.

I hope you will have had a fine day or two lately for Holwood to blow a little sweet air upon you and Mr. Eliot, which, I am sure, will have been good for both. I quarrel a little with the present weather, for though the charming spring-like look it gives everything is delightful there is more damp attending it than I find agrees with my relaxed state, but on the whole I am *very* well for me. Mrs. Stapleton and sweet girl the same.

I am ever, my dear son,

Your most affectionate mother,

H. CH.

Love to Mr. Eliot. Let me remind you of Woodford.

My dear Sons,—Advanced age, and the sense of increasing infirmities, admonish me that soon I must be to exchange this earthly dwelling for one which, by the merits and thro' the merciful mediation of Jesus Christ our Saviour, shall be in the blessed Heaven, trusting in the great and tender goodness of the Almighty that my worldly sins will be forgiven by Him. I feel that I cannot support the idea of leaving you, my beloved sons, without trying to say unto ye how truly my fond affection

M

has increasingly ever attended ye both, and that my constant prayers have been daily addrest to the Omnipotent Disposer of all events, that you might be directed in all things by the blessing of heavenly wisdom, which would best ensure your happiness here and hereafter, and thanksgivings have constantly been offered by me for your conduct in all things, and by which you have established to yourselves *characters* of the most virtuous and able sort. I have now to say on my own part that I beg my *just debts may* be paid, which are exceedings beyond the income I have had to spend, altho' my dear sons have done much for me in their kindness and affection for me. I do not condemn myself for having incurred these *exceedings*, because they were not occasioned by *idle expenses*, but by believing what I did was, from different circumstances, best at the time it was done. I shall have a very improved farm, with, I hope, whenever it may happen, a valuable stock upon it, etc. My dear friend, Mrs. Stapleton, has a demand upon me for all her attention to me a thousand ways. I shall trust in your generosity to acquit me.

I may, perhaps, inclose a sort of memorandum in this, written with *great difficulty* to myself last year, at a time when I thought there was little hope of my surviving many days.

May God Almighty shower down his blessings upon ye both.

April 2, 1794.

Unable from the effects of continued illness, and the increases of the infirmities of age, to say *all* I could in justification of the state of my affairs, I will only express my earnest wish that my chaise and little horses, with my chesnut mare, may be given to Mrs. Stapleton; also my silver tea urn, and my four silver bottle frames, bought by myself.

Aug. 8, 1794.

To the Earl of Chatham and the Right Hon. Mr. Pitt.

(In Lady C.'s handwriting.)

Burton Pynsent: May 7, 1795.

My dear Son,—I am going, after a long *talking* morning, to undertake writing a hasty letter to you, tho' unfitted a good deal to use my pen; but the case presses, and I s<sup>d</sup> be sorry to delay till the next post, w<sup>h</sup> will not be till Sunday. You

are well acquainted with Mr. Mitchell, and you know his merits and his zeal in the public service, and the esteem he is held in by Mr. Eliot and my nephews, who dined with me yesterday, who expressed their regard for him. Now comes the business. . . .

I hope you are blest with the same fine weather that we have here, and that you are capable of snatching opportunities of enjoying it at Clapham (which I am quite happy you like so well) or at delightful Holwood, w<sup>h</sup> I wish five miles nearer to London. I mend with the fine weather, and begin to enjoy something like health again. God in Heaven bless you, my dear son.

H. CH.

Burton Pynsent : July 16, 1795.

The daily wished for post, in this time of expectation for glorious news, arrived last night, bringing us *only*, my very dear son, a most unpleasant account of the riot which had taken place in your neighbourhood, and which completely distressed our feelings. You don't want this information, for you will easily figure to yourself that the idea of your house being visited by the lawless, desperate mob was not of the most agreeable sort. Vincent Stuckey, from a kind attention to relieve the anxiety which it was natural the paragraphs in the papers would create, writ to me the particulars of what passed on the occasion, for which I feel very much obliged to him. I cannot help indulging myself in the satisfaction of congratulating you on having escaped further marks of their *inspired* insolence. Tho' it is impossible, my dearest son, not to be in a degree affected by events of such a kind, yet, thank God, I hold fast my trust that the guardian power of the Almighty will shield and protect the *virtuous* and the upright. You know, I guess, that I am soon to have an account of the day being fixed for my being once again to enjoy the pleasure of receiving your brother and Lady Chatham, with Miss Townshend, at Burton.

I am in hopes that I may hear this evening *positively* what day they will come. We are in great beauty for them, and rejoicing for our plentiful, *promising* crops. The finest weather in the world for hay-making, and I have a noble quantity. I

flatter myself in about a month more we shall sing for joy at the getting in of a harvest that may be a blessing to us. In the meanwhile I pray for the prosperous success in all our enterprises, that the spirit of the people may be kept up till the proper *boon of peace* arrives. God bless and preserve you, my dear son.

Your ever affectionate mother,  
HESTER CHATHAM.

Do say something to encourage poor Mitchell in some hope. He is truly unhappy, and does not deserve to be so.

The finding that we had not a line this evening to satisfy our eager desire of having some charitable letter that might inform us how things had been going on since our last hearing has given us a very unsatisfactory evening, and the addition of our dissappointment of not receiving the *two* usual news papers which are regularly sent us from Downing Street increases the uncomfortableness still more. Not a word from Lady Chatham about the time intended for setting out. Now I beg we may not be left in anxious ignorance any longer, my dear William, or in the cruel uncertainty of suspense.

Burton Pynsent : Oct. 1, 1795.

My dear Son,—I was not made particularly happy by finding last night in the *Sun* that you had had an extraordinary washing in y<sup>r</sup> return, three or four days ago, from Dover to Walmer. If it had been only a refreshing shower that you met with I sh<sup>d</sup> have passed it over, but without being much afraid I shall be a little glad to hear that gout takes no offence at what has happened. We begin to think here that we have had quite rain enough, and to wish for a renewal of our *fair* fine weather; our sowing has gone on prosperously, and now we begin to sigh for winds from the East.

It seems stout in me to wish for a change, but stout I am enough, both in body and mind, very seriously to do it, that our fleet may not be detained. Mrs. Stapleton and her eager admirer of the works she had in charge are very regular *over-seers* of everything in hand, and if they were at home wo<sup>d</sup> assure you of as much.

I am doing wrong in giving my letter more length than I need, but I hate so much troubling you with anything that can be called business that I don't like to come to it. Some small time before y<sup>r</sup> coming hither I rec<sup>d</sup> a pressing petition from Mr. Dayrell, of Lillingstone, to recommend him to you for conferring some Church preferment upon him. I thought the best way of answering him was to say that I feared it w<sup>od</sup> be difficult, from the different engagements I know you had, for me to succeed, but as I had a prospect of seeing you the speaking to you on the subject w<sup>od</sup> be best. I chose doing this to avoid the teasing you with writing about the business, and never once did I think of it in the short course of y<sup>r</sup> stay. No great wonder, sure, when my mind was filled with the happiness of having you, and enjoying the sweet pleasure of interesting discourse together. I will enclose his letter, and if you will give me a line of what I shall answer it will be enough, for I know you can only make your excuse. One thing more, but it is a trivial thing, I must mention. Gill, the Postmaster of Somerton (a very good kind of man), begged me to ask you a favour for a brother, or friend, for I have forgot w<sup>h</sup>, who is in some office of excise, *or something of that sort.* I think I did name it to you, and that it was settled you w<sup>od</sup> take the letter containing the request and put it in your pocket. I am, however, not absolutely assured of it. You will tell me one word about it when you can. Y<sup>r</sup> brother I find is still at Chevely, and Lady Chatham has got the rheumatism in a very disagreeable way, as it affects her side, but he says at the same time she is otherwise well and grows fat. Mr. Eliot and darling girl, I have the satisfaction to learn, are both perfectly well. I expect they will return from Port Eliot the 23rd. I am much afraid that Miss Townshend's time for leaving us is fast approaching, which I truly am very sorry for, as she certainly loves the society she is with. All that is great and all that is good, my dear son, is the constant wish of

Your ever affect. mother,  
H. CHATHAM.

I have written to L<sup>d</sup> Egremont on the Act of Parl<sup>t</sup>.  
No answer yet.

Burton Pynsent: Nov. 4, 1795.

My dear Son,—I could readily employ my pen in writing you on the two very different subjects which have so lately occurred and which are so differently affecting; but it is totally unnecessary to say how shocking the insult offered His Majesty was to all here, and what the impression of delight was in Mr. Eliot's account of the glorious majority in the H. of C., and the praises so happily expressed by him on Mr. Pitt's speech. You will imagine my feelings, and so I shall beg in the cause that engages me to break in upon you now. . . .

I was wished by Mr. Mitchell to inform you of this circumstance, which in the affair of what is of most consequence to him is of no avail. It gives him a step which is so far, I suppose, an advantage.

I am pretty well, and the rest of the company quite so.

Not a word more, my dear, dear son. God Almighty bless you.

H. CH.

No answer is wanted to this.

Burton Pynsent: April 25, 1796.

I do not from you, my dr son, but I hear often of you in a way that makes up to me in the best manner possible for your silence. I cannot, however, help wishing that my pleasure was increased by receiving now and then a few words from you, and immediately comes almost a reflection that obliges me to unwish it again, that I may not take up any part of the small leisure you have to enjoy a little relaxation from your various calls. I am sure you must be satisfied that I am not much disposed to break in upon you, if it is not what I feel a sort of necessity for. Without, therefore, more upon the subject I shall begin my business.

You will have rec'd a letter from Mrs. Stapleton of a few lines written at a late hour, when I was just got into bed, to state my serious request to you, at the earnest petition of Woodforde, that you w<sup>d</sup> have the goodness to appoint him successor to Haviland, who indeed appears to be a man of the basest and most ungrateful character that can exist. His attack upon the Taunton Bank is universally condemned; the circum-

stances of the obligations to [ ? ] or money affairs to the holders of it being so very great. Woodford's increased attendance upon me, which engrossed so much of his time that he certainly suffered with his patients, makes me more interested in his success.

I am quite [ ? ] with the class of *gentlemen* who were so urgent for the appointment of Haviland, with all their fine plans for breaking the monopoly made by Stuckey. I am afraid you cannot enjoy the same pleasure from the fine weather that everybody does here, since the beauties it produces will have been hid in your rides by the clouds of dust like smoke you must have been involved in.

You cannot imagine how charming Burton looks. I had the satisfaction of a most agreeable letter last night from your brother, in which he tells me that the money so *politely* claimed proves to be no more than the £244 div. from the original settlement of poor dear James' fortune as a fifth. I was totally unconscious of its not having been paid, as the account appeared *settled* when returned to me. I learn with great comfort my darling little girl is well and very happy with her Aunt Chatham, and succeeds very well for a lady of her years. Mrs. Stapleton is abroad after her works, and if she were at home I should not be desired to remind you of her letter, as she says you are agreed upon the article of writing.

God bless you, my dear, dear son.

H. CH.

I wish you would tell Mr. Smith about Cooling.

The following letters of Pitt to his mother show the warm and affectionate language he always used to her. The first relates to the well-known duel with Tierney, which was fought on Sunday, May 27, 1798, Pitt's second being Dudley Ryder (afterwards Lord Harrowby):

Holwood: Monday, May 28, 1798.

My dear Mother,—You will be glad, I know, to hear from myself on a subject in which I know how much you will feel

interested, and I am very happy that I have nothing to tell that is not perfectly agreeable. The newspapers of to-day contain a short but correct account of a meeting which I found it necessary to have with Mr. Tierney yesterday on Putney Heath, in consequence of some words which I had used in the House of Commons, and which I did not think it became me to retract or explain. The business terminated without anything unpleasant to either Party, and in a way which left me perfectly satisfied both with myself and my antagonist, who behaved with great propriety. You will, I know, hear from my brother on the subject, but I could not be contented without sending these few lines from myself.

Ever, my dear mother,

Your devoted and affectionate son,

W. Pitt.

Downing Street : Oct. 8, 1799.

I rejoice, my dear mother, in being able to add to the satisfactory account contained in the enclosed 'Gazette' a letter to you from my brother himself, written after the brilliant and important day in which he has had a large share. I have a short letter from the Duke of York, kindly informing me of my brother's safety, and speaking in the most handsome terms of his conduct.

I sent it immediately to Lady Chatham at Ramsgate, but will enclose it to you as soon as she returns it.

It will probably not be long before we hear of fresh events, which I trust will be as favourable.

Ever, my dear mother,

Your devoted and affectionate son,

W. Pitt.

(Enclosed in above.)

Egmont: Oct. 4, Friday morning.

My dear Mother,—I have but a moment to write to you a single line to say that I am perfectly well, and which I hope will reach headquarters in time to go with the Duke's despatches. We succeeded in a general attack on the enemy on Wednesday,

and dislodged him from his position, and I moved in the course of yesterday before this place to reinforce Sir R. Abercrombie, but the enemy, on his approach, unmasked the place, and we have marched in this morning. I have had great fatigue, having passed the last two nights on the top of the sand hills without any cover whatever, but I can assure you I am not in the smallest degree the worse for it. I must refer you to the 'Gazette' for everything else, and have only to add that I remain, my dear mother,

Your most dutiful and affectionate son,  
CHATHAM.

I was very happy at the receipt of your most kind letter, which reached me a few days ago.

The following are the latest letters which I have found from his mother to Pitt. She was so confident of his patience and affection that she never hesitated to remind him again and again of her wishes on behalf of those for whom she bespoke his patronage :

Burton Pynsent: Sept. 14, 1798.

I do not guess where you are, my dear son, but, however, I mean to take my chance in writing to you, though I believe it possible you may think you have had letters enough from Burton since you left it. I cannot but say that for my pleasure I s<sup>d</sup> be glad to hear of you, but at the same time I am very reasonable about doing so. The occasion of your having this is owing to my having received a request from Mrs. Watson that I w<sup>d</sup> name to you her very humble petition in favour of one of her grandsons, a youth of about fourteen. His father, Sir Wm. Gibbon, would be happy indeed, and Mrs. Watson more so than I can express. Now comes the thing : The misfortune is that the object to be obtained is the youth's being made a clerk in the Treasury. I feel how much I have teased you already by my application for the two parties I named to you—Woodford is one and Mr. Sandford the other—and now I am to pray for the third. I cannot give up the first, Woodford, as

indeed, I am most extremely obliged to his father, and have made him the happiest of men by letting him know I had recommended his son to you. Young Sandford I have not mentioned, and think I may put it by at present. There is one thing that I believe will facilitate your *not* finding any difficulty about Woodford, which is, that it seems clear that it is not imagined that the *young Gibbon* will be of sufficient age to be brought forward till he is of the proper time of day for such a post. I will enclose you Mrs. Watson's letter, which is so modest, so grateful, and so tender for the sake of those for whom she is so naturally interested, that I am inclined to believe you will wish to add comfort to her. I have not lately heard from Colchester, but, thank God, by their last letter everything was well. I will not lengthen my letter but to say that it is hoped that the *Traveller* arrived safe with the waggon on this day se'enight from Burton.

I remain ever, my dear son,  
Y<sup>r</sup> most affectionate mother,  
H. CH.

Burton Pynsent: Nov. 3, 1798.

I have thought, my dear son, that with the continual success which has attended '*our nice little island*,' you have had full enough business without adding to the trouble of it by writing to you, especially as I had learnt that you had suffered by allowing yourself too much exercise at Walmer.

I please myself with the belief that what I meet with in the papers about your parties and dinners, etc., are true, w<sup>h</sup> relieve very much my anxiety about the Parl<sup>t</sup>. I have not heard of y<sup>r</sup> brother for some time, as between his military duties and his shooting he was too much engaged. However, two or three days ago brought a letter from Lady Chatham that they were returned in perfect health and spirits to Colchester, where I find they mean to stay till the meeting. We have not learnt here yet to forget the loss of your dear society. Burton is not the same Burton as when you was with us. The return of the dear girl from Port Eliot has enlivened us a great deal, and we have had the pleasure of Lady Fortescue and her daughter

Hester for some days. They left us Wednesday, to the no small regret of those they left behind.

Now I cannot refuse myself *repeating* my petition to you, which is really important to me on various accounts. It is that you wo<sup>d</sup> really have the goodness to appoint Woodforde's son that I recommended to you when you was here. He is about 20 years old, a very promising young man, and quite genteel. It wo<sup>d</sup> confer the greatest happiness on the father, to whom, as I have mentioned before, I am truly obliged. I will not add more to the length of this letter than to express to you my increasing wishes and prayers for your perfect health and success in all you desire.

Ever, my dear son,

Your most affect. mother,

H. Ch.

Mrs. Stapleton joins in every good wish.

*Flint Castle*.—The most stormy, dark, horrid day imaginable. I hope it won't reach you.

Pitt must have had infinite patience and been a long-suffering Prime Minister if he did not feel a little worried by the task assigned to him in the following letter :

Nov. 6, 1798.

You have so lately heard from me, my dear son, that I should certainly not so soon have written again to you, but this morning I had a visit from my *protégé*, Carteret, who came to take leave of me, as he had received the Duke of York's orders that if he was in *readiness* to sail orders should be immediately given for preparing a proper boat of conveyance to carry him to join the Reg<sup>t</sup> at Gibraltar. Carteret himself believes the letter he received was written by the *Duke himself*. He has answered it, but I am very doubtful about the propriety of it, and have therefore thought for the sake of the young man that the best step I could take for him was to petition you to have the goodness to do what you know is rightest for him.

I enclose his letter to the Duke sealed as it is, but have accompanied it with a copy, by which you will judge whether it

will be right to send it or not. The army agent may be the person who has been employed to write, but the thing to know is who it really comes from. This is all I can say about it, except you will let me be informed of what is the state by any of your business people. It is a late hour—2.30. I will wish you a good night. Bless you, my dear son.

HESTER CHATHAM.

Pitt was greatly attached to his eldest brother,<sup>1</sup> thought well of his capacity, and was always anxious to give him such employment as he thought would be agreeable to him and at the same time not disadvantageous to the public service.

Lord Chatham was an officer in the army, of much ability and of excellent intentions. The first employment he received from his brother was that of First Lord of the Admiralty—an office in which he does not appear to have been always prudent. From his dilatory habits he was called ‘the late Lord Chatham,’ and from a letter of the Duke of Richmond,<sup>2</sup> published by Lord Stanhope, it would appear that five years after his appointment he had never spoken in the House of Lords.

It is to be inferred from the correspondence that Pitt was reluctantly forced to the conclusion in the month of November 1794 that it would be desirable to change his brother from the Admiralty to another office.

<sup>1</sup> Born September 10, 1756; entered the Army, 1778; was First Lord of the Admiralty, 1788 to December 1794; Privy Seal, December 1794; Lord President of the Council, 1796–1801; Master-General of Ordnance, 1801–6; he commanded the disastrous Walcheren expedition; married a daughter of Lord Sydney; died 1835.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Eldon gave it as his deliberate opinion that Lord Chatham was ‘the ablest man he ever knew in the Cabinet’ (*Private Papers of William Wilberforce*, 1897, p. 136). This appears quite extravagant, unless Lord Eldon was a poor observer or was disposed to underrate his other colleagues. Wraxall says his manners ‘forbid approach.’

From the tone of the letters it may be assumed that Lord Chatham was not at the time a satisfactory head of the department; but it may, I think, also be gathered from a knowledge of the then position of the recent coalition of Portland and his friends that Lord Spencer was quite available to fill a vacancy at the Admiralty. Nothing could be more difficult or distasteful than Pitt's task, and yet he managed with extraordinary skill to combine affection and firmness in his letters to his brother. Lord Chatham's letters were also marked by great affection, but it was manifest that he struggled to retain the Prime Minister's good opinion as to his administration :

My dear Brother,—I do not write to you till after a very painful struggle in my own mind, and it is under a full persuasion that what I have to say is absolutely required from me under the present circumstances, both by duty and pressing necessity. After the full explanation passed between us some time since, I had really flattered myself that there was an end of the distressing embarrassment which we had experienced, and that no further difficulty of the same sort would occur again. But I cannot disguise from you that from various circumstances (which I see no good in dwelling upon), and especially from what passed at the Cabinet yesterday, I foresee too evidently the renewal of that embarrassment and the utter impossibility that business should permanently go on between you and those with whom in your present department you must have continual intercourse with that cordiality and complete mutual confidence which at the present moment is indispensable. If public considerations alone were in question they ought to decide my opinion; but on more personal grounds I really believe that for your ultimate credit and happiness, as well as my own, anything is preferable to a state in which the inconvenience to the Service cannot be greater than the vexation to ourselves.

In this opinion I believe you will agree with me, and I therefore trust that you will think that I consult my affection to you as much as what I owe to the other considerations in telling you fairly, though reluctantly, my perfect conviction that the time is come when it will be the best for us both, as well as for the public service, if you will exchange your present situation for one of a different description. . . . The situation of President of the Council or of Privy Seal (according as Lord Stafford may take or decline the former) is still open. If you are willing to take either of them, I have no doubt that the King's kindness to us both will make him approve it, and to the King it would be necessary to explain that some unfortunate misunderstanding made us propose it as best for his service. You will easily see that the time presses, and will not wonder that, having formed this opinion in full reflection, I do not for a moment withhold it from you. I have preferred telling it you by letter to a conversation, which must be unnecessarily distressing to us both, and to which I really do not feel myself equal.

Always affectionately yours,  
W. Pitt.

[No date, but must be December 1, 1794.]

The letter was the decision of a Prime Minister, conveyed with the love of a brother. Chatham replied at once :

Admiralty: Dec. 1, 1794.

My dear Brother,—You certainly have judged right in thinking that in every point of view your letter must come most unexpectedly upon me, and I really hardly know what to think or what to say. In time of peace, whatever preference I might have had between one office and another, and which perhaps might not have been great, I should most certainly have been guided by any accommodation that could be afforded to the general objects of Government. But I must confess that the same objections as last year, and more particularly the same moment being taken—the eve of the meeting of Parliament—give

me the impression that I would not quit at this moment without being subjected to great misconstruction. You will, I am sure, recollect that I undertook the situation I am in by your desire and advice, and that I have sacrificed to it every other consideration, and I am not conscious, in the discharge of it, of having failed in my duty to the public, and less in anything towards you.

As no particular ill success, beyond the common and necessary accidents of war, have attended us, I am sure there must be something more than you have yet liked to mention which must have occasioned your letter, and I shall of course be most impatient to see you as soon as it may be convenient to you, as I cannot but feel great anxiety on an occasion which involves in it every consideration that ought to be most dear to me.

I am, my dear brother, yours very affectionately,

CHATHAM.

If you let me know when you come to town, I will either call upon you or shall be glad to see you here, as you please.

Pitt's answer argued the point firmly and kindly :

Downing Street : Tuesday, Dec. 2nd, 1794,  $\frac{1}{2}$  past 12.

My dear Brother,—It gives me more pain than I can express to decline a conversation with you on any subject on which you wish it, but it would be still more painful to enter upon it on such an occasion, and I really can see no possibility that explanation or discussion can be of any advantage.

I hoped I had said enough in my former letter to show you that my opinion was formed (however reluctantly) on grounds which will not admit of its being changed; and I cannot, in times like these, acquit myself to my own mind if I do not ultimately act on that opinion, even with the sacrifice, if necessary, of the personal considerations which are nearest my heart. You are really mistaken if you suppose that I have any one particular circumstance to state which has been the immediate cause of these ideas being now brought forward.

They are the result of much anxious reflection, and if they are become more urgent at this particular time it is because I

consider the general situation of affairs is one in which it is more than ever indispensable to omit nothing that can tend to put every branch of the Government on the footing most likely to carry us thro' our difficulties. The circumstance of Parliament being to meet within a month does not seem to me to produce any difficulty, when it is considered that if such a change is to take place at all during the war the close of a campaign is certainly the period when it will be attended with the least inconvenience. Nor do I see any reason why your acceding to the arrangement should be liable to any misconstruction, or why it should be supposed to take place on any other ground but that of suiting the convenience or inclination of the persons who are concerned in it. The successful exertions which have been made, and the general state in which you would leave our naval force, are circumstances which, as I mentioned to you before, seem to me to give additional facility to the measure, because they are the most convincing proofs of the manner in which you have provided for the most essential objects of the service. At the same time, neither these circumstances (however creditable), nor the conviction of the attention which you have given to the business of the Admiralty, and the compleat knowledge which you have acquired of it, can overbalance the considerations which I have already stated to you, or in any degree alter the opinion which I have been obliged to confess. Whether you think me right or wrong in the opinion, you will, I am sure, give me credit for the sincerity of it, and you will, I am also sure, be sensible that if I do sincerely entertain it I should not do my duty to you or to the public or to myself if I yielded even to your wishes or to any private feelings of my own. In one word, I ought not to remain in my present situation, under all the present circumstances, if I were disposed to shrink from any part of my duty, however painful. I can only entreat you, for both our sakes, to make it in this instance as little painful as possible by reconciling your mind to what I have proposed, and to save me from the extremity of feeling that I act against your wishes when I yield to the necessity of the public service.

Very affectionately yours,  
W. PITT.

Chatham was plainly very anxious for a personal interview, and in his reply of the same day he urged : ‘ I hope I am not unreasonable in earnestly desiring to see you in the course of the day, when you recollect that to-morrow I must meet my colleagues in office, and I must attend the King. And you will, I think, see that without something further passing between us I must stand in a very perplexing situation.’

Pitt yielded to the request for an interview, pointing out, however, that nothing could change his opinion. He sent a short note the next day, in which he said : ‘ It is too late for conversation this evening, but I will call upon you soon after twelve to-morrow, unless you prefer any other hour. I trust your decision will have been such as to relieve me from the most anxious of all situations. My own opinion remains and must remain the same.’

Admiralty : Dec. 4, 1794.

My dear Brother,—I have had a variety of things to do, nor have I been able to compose myself sufficiently to make up my mind. But what makes me wish to write you these few lines is that I am aware in our conversations I have said nothing of my personal feelings towards you, which, I can assure you, arose only from finding myself unequal to doing it, as the recollection of the affection which has uninterruptedly subsisted between us from our earliest days makes me feel the present circumstances doubly painful to what would have been the case if our connexion, of however old a date, had been purely political. I will only add that, whatever may be my fate in life, I shall sincerely wish for your honor and prosperity.

Believe me, very affectly yrs.,  
CHATHAM.

Chatham the next morning wrote a further letter rather receding from his request for an interview, but expressing fears that his resignation might be interpreted to his discredit. Pitt closed the correspondence with the following considerate letter :

Downing Street: Friday, Dec. 5, 1794.

My dear Brother,—Tho' I can add nothing to the statements which I have already expressed, I wish to assure you that the painful reflection described in your last letter has never been absent from my mind during any part of what has passed; but my great consolation has been, and is, the persuasion that in going thro' this severe trial *I am persuaded* that I am really consulting my personal affection to you as much as every other motive by which I must be guided.

Yrs. very affectly,  
W. Pitt.

The matter was adjusted by Chatham becoming Privy Seal, and subsequently Lord President of the Council. The relations between the two brothers remained on the most affectionate and harmonious basis. Pitt has been accused of being unduly anxious to give his brother important public offices, but this correspondence is valuable as showing how resolutely he could subordinate all such feelings to his sense of public duty. It is much to his honour, and shows the lofty independence of his mind. Although all the particulars of Lord Chatham's retiring from the Admiralty were not known at the time, it may be inferred from a paragraph in one of Lord Fitzwilliam's letters to Lord Carlisle that something was, at all events, suspected on the subject.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Fitzwilliam to Carlisle, March 28, 1795 (*Hist. MSS. Com.*, Lord

The embarrassment of Pitt's finances has often been criticised, and an explanation been asked how a bachelor, leading a most regular life, with no expensive tastes, and in receipt of 10,000*l.* a year during the later years of his Administration, should have often been in difficulties. His friends had to come to his rescue when he resigned office in 1801, and Parliament voted 40,000*l.* to pay his debts on his death.

It is just possible that he may from time to time have assisted his brother with money, and thus helped to add to his own difficulties.

The following document amongst the 'Pretymen MSS.' is suggestive :

Hyde Park Corner: August 18, 1797.

Received from the Rt. Honble. William Pitt the sum of 1,000*l.*, payable immediately after the 5th Janry., 1798.

CHATHAM.

However this may be, there can be no doubt of the attachment between the brothers. Pitt arranged that the Garter which he would not take himself should be given to his brother, and he associated him with his friend, the Bishop, in the management of his affairs—almost his last act on his death-bed.

*Carlisle's Papers*) : 'Has there been no removal of his own friends at the Admiralty? Or did Lord Spencer, on his succeeding Lord Chatham, act inconsistently with the spirit of the Union when he required such changes and the constitution of such a Board as, judging for himself, should command his confidence?'

## CHAPTER VI

## LORD FITZWILLIAM

Pitt's attitude towards Viceroyalty of Lord Fitzwilliam—Criticism at time—More acute now—Junction of Portland and his friends—Believed that Portland was to have control of Irish affairs—Rumour about Viceroyalty—Fitzwilliam appointed—His foolish conduct—Pitt alarmed—Views of Dundas—Of Lord Grenville—Pitt insisted on clear understanding as to Fitzwilliam's powers—His memorandum—‘The Pelham Papers’—Full memorandum of what occurred at meeting before Fitzwilliam went to Ireland—The Ponsonbys—O'Beirne—Portland's previous clearance of officials—The Ponsonbys a controlling force—Grattan—Fitzwilliam's character and good intentions—Encouraged wild hopes—Nothing to show he had mastered questions—Not suited for troubled time—The Catholic question—Grattan moves with approval of Fitzwilliam—Against his instructions—His conduct in reference to offices and places—Beresfords to be pulled down—And Ponsonbys raised up—Lord Auckland's account of understanding of position—Dismissal of Beresford—Offered pension equal to his salary—Appeals to Pitt—Fitzgibbon on Grattan's Bill—Conveys his opinion on coronation oath to King—View of the Cabinet on Grattan's Bill—Catholic Committee, 1792—Relief Act, 1793—Portland writes disapproval to Fitzwilliam—Pitt's letter to Fitzwilliam—His reply—His recall—Debated at time in Parliament and press—Fitzwilliam's letter to King—King's to Pitt—Fitzwilliam's correspondence with Carlisle—Loughborough's opinion—‘Explanation’ drawn up by Loughborough, Burke, Grattan, and Fitzwilliam—Before Fitzwilliam went to Ireland—Fitzwilliam's charges against Beresford—Beresford challenges him—Interrupted duel—Apology of Fitzwilliam—His hasty action about offices—Law officers—O'Beirne made a bishop—Swift and Kirwan—Fitzwilliam's responsibility—Verdict of his own friends—Results of recall—The real injury—Its limits—Extreme men not affected—Wolfe Tone—Secret Committee—Plans of invasion—‘Smothered war’—Rebellion—Cornwallis.

POSSIBLY there is no part of Pitt's Ante-Union policy in Ireland more criticised, particularly in recent times,



Joshua Reynolds pinxit

Walker & Russell pubd. 20.

Earl Fitzwilliam.



than his attitude towards the Viceroyalty of Lord Fitzwilliam. Some obvious questions must be considered before any fair decision can be arrived at. What led to Lord Fitzwilliam's appointment? What caused his speedy recall? Who is to blame for his failure? What was its effect on Ireland?

At and immediately after its date, the matter excited much attention and much difference of opinion. In more recent times it has, if possible, attracted increased attention, and a more acute difference of opinion. Mr. Lecky, Mr. Gladstone and Lord Rosebery have all written upon the subject. How did this short Viceroyalty find such a controversial place in Irish history? In July 1794 the Duke of Portland<sup>1</sup> and some of his leading friends, including Lord Spencer and Windham, joined Pitt's Government<sup>2</sup>—the period being one when, owing to the state of affairs in France and on the Continent, Great Britain required the support of all her

<sup>1</sup> William Henry Cavendish Bentinck, third Duke of Portland, born 1738; succeeded 1762; appointed, 1765, Lord Chamberlain; 1782, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland; 1783, First Lord of the Treasury; 1794, Secretary of State, to 1801; 1801, Lord President of the Council till 1805; 1807, First Lord of the Treasury. Married Lady Dorothy Cavendish, daughter of William, fourth Duke of Devonshire, 1766; died 1809.

<sup>2</sup> There had been much earlier negotiations for this coalition. In 1792 Burke was negotiating with Pitt for the accession of the Duke of Portland and his friends, and, in speaking of terms of adjustment with France, Pitt observed they ought to be founded on the basis of indemnity for the past and security for the future. On this Burke, who had no relish for such an arrangement, drew himself up and pompously said, 'Sir, I am authorised by the Duke of Portland to state that he abhors indemnity and detests security!' (*Sidmouth's Life*, i. 89, by Pellew). Fitzwilliam was mixed up with these negotiations of 1792, and showed a strong and narrow prejudice against Sheridan, saying he might have a lucrative office, but never should be admitted to one of confidence (*Maltesbury Diary and Correspondence*, ii. 465).

sons. The Duke of Portland had been a Prime Minister and a Viceroy of Ireland. The place he now took was that of Secretary of State, the department specially in touch with the Irish Executive.

It was believed that Portland was to have much voice in Irish affairs. It was said that Ireland was given away to him, and this was probably at first his own view and that of his friends. There was much delay about displacing the Viceroy, Lord Westmoreland. Many weeks elapsed without anything being done. Rumour was busy with the names of Lord Spencer, the Duke of Devonshire, and Lord Fitzwilliam,<sup>1</sup> all of whom were said to have refused the office. In September the office was reported to have been accepted by Fitzwilliam, but before the end of the following month, rumour hinted that Lord Spencer might be the Viceroy, with Grenville as Chief Secretary. Then in November a fresh story came to Ireland that Lord Westmoreland was to stay for the Session, and be succeeded by Fitzwilliam, with full powers.

But Fitzwilliam had been actually selected for and accepted the place, possibly as early as the first rumour, and all the facts indicate that he liked its importance and responsibility. He proclaimed it on the house-tops. Lord Rosebery<sup>2</sup> says : ‘The news of his approaching

<sup>1</sup> Born 1748, died 1833 ; married (1) a daughter of Lord Bessborough, and (2) a daughter of Lord Ponsonby. The Whigs, in their Regency arrangements of 1788, intended to make Fitzwilliam their Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland. He was nephew and heir of Lord Rockingham, and was intended by Fox to be President of his new India Board in 1783. In 1812 he refused the Garter, but in 1798 he was appointed Lord-Lieutenant of Yorkshire. He was dismissed from his post in 1819 for his language at a meeting to censure magistrates for the Peterloo Massacre.

<sup>2</sup> *Pitt*, p. 172, by Lord Rosebery.

Viceroyalty became common property in Ireland. This premature revelation of an appointment in contemplation, but not actually settled, was the first of Fitzwilliam's disastrous indiscretions. It gave a mortal blow to whatever reputation for prudence he may have possessed, and led directly to the unhappy catastrophe which followed.'

When all this folly reached the ears of Pitt, he felt anxious and uneasy about the appointment of the new Viceroy, and half formed the resolution of recalling it. His mistake possibly was in not boldly undoing the blunder when he realised the turmoil that Fitzwilliam caused, but it would have lost the Duke of Portland and his friends, and the crisis was not one to permit the withdrawal of any support. So, hoping against hope, he said that Fitzwilliam must at all events be bound by some clear understanding.

Even that nearly cost Pitt his new allies, but Pitt would not give way, and he was the strong man and would not listen to new systems, or proscriptions of old friends, or giving any man, much less Fitzwilliam, a free hand on great and delicate points of policy. The situation gave intense dissatisfaction to Dundas and Pitt's older colleagues. Dundas on October 13, 1794, wrote the following letter<sup>1</sup> to Pitt :

My dear Sir,—I have seldom in my lifetime been more astonished than by the receipt of your letter this morning—I mean that part of it respecting Ireland. They may put what gloss upon it they please, but if it does come to an extremity they never can make a case that will not damn them as public men for ever, and the whole gives me so bad an impression of

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*

them that, barring the awkwardness of the moment, I know not if you are not better without them. It is perfectly clear that you cannot give way without bringing yourself down in your situation in a manner not to be conceived. I would rather give them the Government altogether than to be so swindled. Your not acceding to their ideas about Ireland may be a reason, if you please, for Lord Fitzwilliam going there, but how is that to justify their embarrassing Government at the present moment by resignations, &c., and that, too, after their friends have been loaded with honours and favours which cannot be recalled or resigned?

It is abominable swindling, of which the Old Baillie provides no example. Have they forgot that Ireland was going on in supporting the general cause of mankind, postponing for the present all local or subordinate considerations?

If therefore any confusion arises in Ireland in consequence of a breach with them, it is a confusion of their creating, and originating in the inauspicious union formed with them. . . .

Yours ever sincerely,  
H. DUNDAS.

Dundas by no means stood alone in his views. Lord Grenville, on October 15, writing to Thomas Grenville, discussed all the dangers of Fitzwilliam's appointment, and on October 24, wrote: <sup>1</sup> ‘ Has Lord Fitzwilliam still kept himself sufficiently open with respect to his engagements with Grattan and the Ponsonbys as to be able to undertake the Irish Government with honour and satisfaction to himself, without displacing the old tenants of Government to make room for their opponents, and without giving to the Ponsonbys in particular more influence and power than belongs to their situation as one among several of the great connections in that country? If not, there seems no hope of any perma-

<sup>1</sup> Buckingham's *Courts and Cabinets of George III.*

nent agreement on this subject, even if it were so patched up for the present as that he could go to Ireland.'

Pitt did not yield to any intemperate counsels, but he asserted his views and was very determined that there should be no room left for misunderstanding. He would not leave 'the supporters of the Government exposed to the risk of a new system'; he would not tolerate the idea of any 'new system' whatever. The matters were far too important to be left in doubt. If Fitzwilliam was to go to Ireland, it could only be on a clear understanding, which no one could deny, forget, or misunderstand.

A formal meeting was held by Pitt and Portland, Spencer, Fitzwilliam, Grenville, and Windham; and it was distinctly agreed that there was to be no new system of men or measures; that the new Viceroy should prevent, as far as he could, during the present Session, any agitation of the Catholic question; that he should refer that and all other important measures, with his opinion, to the Cabinet; and that he should do nothing in such matters to commit the Government without instructions.<sup>1</sup>

This would have bound most men. To a man who knew anything of public life, this clear understanding with his colleagues would have been sacred. If he felt that, from his past acts and his strong convictions, he could not comply with the formulated understanding, he should say so and resign; but if he accepted and

<sup>1</sup> A very clear memorandum stating these points was found among Pitt's papers (*Prettyman MSS.*; Stanhope's *Life of Pitt*, vol. ii.).

assented, it would be hard to defend his subsequent non-compliance. Fitzwilliam, however, knew little of public or official life: he foolishly accepted a compact which his own previous acts had made it almost impossible for *him* to fulfil. Another man might: but it required another man. Fitzwilliam could not, and he should have recognised the fact. He, however, retained his nomination—unfortunately for himself, unfortunately for Ireland, and most unfortunately for the friendly relations between the two countries.

In the month of March, 1795, the Ministers present at these meetings agreed to a minute<sup>1</sup> embodying what passed on these occasions, and that most important document is now<sup>2</sup> in the British Museum, amongst the

<sup>1</sup> This is manifest from the following letters in the *Pelham Papers* at the British Museum (vol. xxxiii. 101, fol. 163):—

‘*Lord Grenville to Right Hon. Mr. Pelham.*

‘Downing Street, March 28, 1795.

‘Dear Sir,—You will not, I am sure, be surprised that I have not been able sooner to keep my promise of sending you the memorandum of which we talked. I now forward it by this messenger to Lord Camden, who will send it on to you. It has been communicated to all the persons here who were present at the conversations in question, and they entirely concur in the statement. I much fear, from the account which your letters contain of Lord Fitzwilliam’s present state of mind, there will be no possibility of avoiding public discussion of some of the points; but I am sure such a necessity, if it should exist, ought not to be created by us.

‘Yours most sincerely,

‘GRENVILLE.’

*Same day—‘Duke of Portland to Pelham.*

‘When I arrived at a meeting this morning at Lord Grenville’s, for the purpose of finally settling the minute of the conversations which passed at Mr. Pitt’s some time previous to Lord Fitzwilliam’s departure respecting measures and arrangements relative to Ireland, a copy of which I transmit you herewith, I found Mr. Pitt and Mr. W. full of apprehension and gloom. . . . ’

<sup>2</sup> *Pelham Papers* in British Museum (*Additional MSS.* 3118, fol. 268). It is quoted in part by Mr. Lecky (vii. 86).

‘Pelham Papers.’ It is not signed, and it is headed ‘Memorandum, March 1795.’ Its most important parts are as follows :

## MEMORANDUM.

March 1795.

When the union of the persons who are joined in the present Government was formed in July last, the office of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland was destined to Lord Fitzwilliam as soon as it should be found practicable to open a proper situation for Lord Westmoreland in England. Before the means of making such an arrangement were found, the intention of appointing Lord Fitzwilliam as the successor to Lord Westmoreland became known in Ireland; the appointment was talked of as immediate, and it was reported that a complete change in the system of Irish Government, both as to men and measures, was intended. Some explanations having taken place on these points in the course of the autumn, it appeared that Lord Fitzwilliam had, in fact, formed the intention of removing Lord Fitzgibbon from the office of Lord Chancellor, and a variety of other circumstances appeared to some of his colleagues to give too much countenance to the apprehensions of an intended change of system in Ireland. The removal of Lord Fitzgibbon was objected to on their part as being inconsistent with the principles on which the business had been formed here; and the same principle was stated by them as applying to the removal of the old servants of the Government, and to any other measure which would have the appearance either of introducing a new system or of casting imputations on the conduct of former Governments in Ireland.

It appears that Lord Fitzwilliam conceives himself to have stated to Mr. Pitt, in their first conversations on the subject of Ireland, that he was apprehensive Mr. Beresford should be removed, and that Mr. Pitt made no objection in reply to this. Mr. Pitt has no recollections of anything having been said to him which conveyed to his mind the impression that Mr. Beresford’s removal from his office was intended.

After much discussion on the subject of Lord Fitzgibbon’s removal, the idea was renounced, and the most explicit assur-

ances were given by Lord Fitzwilliam that he had not in view the establishment of any new system in Ireland, but that he was desirous of strengthening his Government by the accession of Mr. Ponsonby and his friends, and the support of Mr. Grattan. . . .

It was agreed that a meeting should be held at Mr. Pitt's at which all the other points that had occurred respecting Ireland should be discussed. . . . This meeting was accordingly held at Mr. Pitt's in the [blank]. There were present the Duke of Portland, Lord Fitzwilliam, Lord Spencer, Lord Grenville, Mr. Pitt, and Mr. Windham. The points which were discussed at this meeting, and the conclusions adopted respecting them, were as follows :—

1. (As to the appointment of Provost.)

2. Mr. William Ponsonby was proposed by Lord Fitzwilliam as Secretary of State; but 'it was proposed to him that Mr. Ponsonby might be made Keeper of the Signet, and the office of Secretary of State be annexed to that of Chief Secretary, and this arrangement was, after much difficulty and discussion, agreed to by Lord Fitzwilliam.'

3. Lord Fitzwilliam proposed that Mr. G. Ponsonby should be made Attorney-General. To this the strongest objections were stated. The situation and merits of Mr. Wolfe; the natural claims of Mr. Toler, the Solicitor-General; and the impropriety of bringing Mr. G. Ponsonby at once into the office of Attorney-General—a measure which, when coupled with the appointment of Mr. W. Ponsonby, would, it was said, countenance the opinion of a change of system in Ireland. . . . No idea was intimated by Lord Fitzwilliam of removing Mr. Wolfe against his inclinations. . . . It was at last agreed (after much discussion about Mr. Toler) that Lord Fitzwilliam should endeavour in the first instance to make a satisfactory arrangement for Mr. Toler, in order that Mr. G. Ponsonby might be made Solicitor-General under Mr. Wolfe. There was some discussion respecting the nature of the arrangement to be proposed to Mr. Toler, and it was distinctly expressed and agreed to by Lord Fitzwilliam that the just claims of Mr. Toler were to be satisfied,

taking them on the grounds of his situation such as it stood with Lord Westmoreland, so that he should not be called upon to accede to any proposal to which there should not be just reason to believe that he would have acceded had Lord Westmoreland continued to hold the Government, but that, on the other hand, Mr. Toler would not be countenanced in refusing a reasonable offer.

4. ‘None of the persons present at this conversation recollect any mention to have been made of Mr. Curran; nor was it known to some of them that Lord Fitzwilliam had ever thought of proposing that gentleman for Solicitor-General till after Lord Fitzwilliam’s arrival in Ireland.’

5. Abolition of additional offices in the Revenue Boards. The matter was to stand over until Lord Fitzwilliam could investigate the gentlemen in Ireland. ‘His colleagues would willingly leave it to him to consider the subject on such information as he might receive respecting it in Ireland, desiring only that before any such measure was adopted they might have the opportunity of deliberating upon it.’

Nothing was intimated in this conversation of any idea of removing Mr. Beresford, nor was even his name mentioned by Lord Fitzwilliam, although the different means which might be adopted for lessening the number of the Commissioners of the Revenue Boards formed a part of what he stated on the subject of those Boards.

The appointment of a Primate, respecting which there was no difference of opinion, and some other subjects of less importance, having been also mentioned, the conversation turned to the course to be pursued respecting the public measures, on which it was understood that on all important subjects Lord Fitzwilliam should transmit all the information he could collect, with his opinion, to the King’s servants here, and that he should do nothing to commit the King’s Government in such cases without fresh instructions from hence. It is also distinctly recollected by some of the persons present that the Catholic question was particularly mentioned, though not discussed at much length, that no decided sentiment was expressed by any-

one as to the line which it might be right ultimately to adopt, but that the same general principles before stated were considered as applying to this, as well as to other questions of importance, and that a strong opinion was stated that Lord Fitzwilliam should, if possible, prevent the agitation of the question at all during the present Session.

At the close of the conversation, Lord Fitzwilliam, who had brought to the meeting a memorandum of the matters to be talked of, was repeatedly asked whether there were any other points to be discussed, or any new measures to be proposed. The answer was that he knew of none.

Lord Fitzwilliam went immediately into the country, and in a very short time after his return he set out for Ireland. What has passed since that period between him and the King's servants is to be found in the Correspondence.

It is impossible to conceive a document of more importance, of higher authority. It throws a flood of light upon the whole Fitzwilliam episode, and brings into great prominence his rashness and imprudence, and shows how impossible it was for his colleagues to rely upon him or to bind him to any engagements.

The Duke of Portland had been Viceroy of Ireland in 1782, and had then graduated in Irish politics. He then brought with him, as private secretary, the Rev. Thomas Lewis O'Beirne,<sup>1</sup> formerly a Roman Catholic priest, and subsequently a Protestant clergyman, and made the acquaintance of the Ponsonbys<sup>2</sup>—a very power-

<sup>1</sup> Consecrated Bishop of Ossory 1795; translated to Meath 1798; died 1823.

<sup>2</sup> There were three Ponsonbys: (1) The father, the Right Hon. John Ponsonby, second son of the first Earl of Bessborough; born 1713; married, 1743, Lady Elizabeth Cavendish, second daughter of the third Duke of Devonshire; M.P. for Newtown and for the County of Kilkenny for a long series of Parliaments; elected Speaker 1756; resigned 1771; appointed Secretary to the Revenue Board 1742; succeeded his father

ful family, very ambitious, very clever, thoroughly familiar with Irish Statecraft. George Ponsonby, then a young man of promise and ability, a member of the bar, was much in the Viceroy's confidence, and he and O'Beirne were consulted on all important subjects.

The Duke of Portland, when Viceroy, made a large clearance of officials who had been acting under his predecessor, Lord Carlisle. He dismissed the two Law Officers, the Prime Sergeant, the Counsel to the Commissioners of Revenue, and one of the Under Secretaries. George Ponsonby, then not three years at the Bar, was made Counsel to the Board of Revenue, of which his father was Commissioner. The Duke of Portland, after he joined Pitt in 1794, summoned George Ponsonby to London to take part in the discussions on the Irish situation and the Irish appointments.

From the beginning to the end of the Viceroyalty of Fitzwilliam, the Ponsonbys were a controlling force. The new Viceroy had no official experience, having only held the office of Lord President for a few weeks, and his Chief Secretary, Lord Milton,<sup>1</sup> never before and

as Commissioner 1744; died 1787. (2) His eldest son, the Right Hon. Wm. B. Ponsonby, M.P. for Cork City, Bandon Bridge, and Kilkenny, 1768-1806; created, 1806, Baron Ponsonby; died same year. (3) His second son, the Right Hon. George Ponsonby; called to the Bar 1780; Counsel to the Board of Revenue 1782; M.P. Wicklow, Inistiogue and Galway in different Parliaments before Union; M.P. after Union for Wicklow, Tavistock, and Peterborough; appointed, 1806, Lord Chancellor of Ireland; died 1817. His daughter Charlotte married the Right Hon. Denis Bowes Daly, M.P. for Galway and King's County before the Union. The first wife of Fitzwilliam was daughter of the second Earl of Bessborough, while his second wife was also a Ponsonby, daughter of Lord Ponsonby.

<sup>1</sup> Eldest son of the Earl of Dorchester; born 1745; M.P. for Dorchester 1780-4-90, for Milton 1798; died 1808.

never after held office, and had no knowledge of Irish affairs. Acting possibly on the Duke of Portland's advice, he brought over O'Beirne as his private secretary. Thus, Lord Fitzwilliam would naturally look to George Ponsonby—a very able and experienced member of the House of Commons, a near relation of Lady Fitzwilliam—and also to O'Beirne, who had previous experience—for advice and guidance, each being accredited and vouched for by his friend and colleague, the Duke of Portland. There were many things that in the mind of Ponsonby required change. When the Duke of Portland left Ireland in 1783, John Ponsonby, the father, was a Commissioner of the Revenue, and George was Counsel to the Board. His father, however, died in 1787, and he himself had been dismissed and replaced by Marcus Beresford. Thus, on the accession of Lord Fitzwilliam the Beresfords occupied very much the position the Ponsonbys had held when the Duke of Portland left Ireland.

Grattan was also a kind of Minister without a portfolio, a general adviser without office ; but possibly, on questions of patronage, Ponsonby and O'Beirne did not desire much interference.

Lord Fitzwilliam was a man of the highest character ; possibly not of much ability, or a good judge of men. In ability, shrewdness, knowledge of men and affairs, he was a child beside George Ponsonby. He was full of good intentions—particularly the good intention of showing that he had better intentions than his predecessors. He encouraged all kinds of wild hopes and extravagant expectations after he was selected, but

before he took office, by proclaiming that he came as a new broom to make a clean sweep—to get rid of the ‘old lot’; a man with a new system, and ready to do what he could for the Catholics. The Duke of Portland had tried ‘the clean sweep’ system in 1782 : why should not he in 1795 ?

There is nothing to show that he had studied or made himself acquainted with Irish history or Irish affairs. He was certainly connected with the country by a great property in the county Wicklow, and he was a great nobleman with honest thoughts ; but there is nothing to show that he had studied the Irish question, or had mastered its difficulties, or was clearly acquainted with the position of the Catholics, the Acts gradually passed in their favour, or the great amelioration in their position which occurred under the very recent measure of 1793. There is nothing to show that he was impressed with the dangerous position of Ireland at the time, the aims and objects of the United Irishmen, the avowed intentions and projects of an invasion held by many, or that he realised the tremendously critical position in which England was placed at the time he became Viceroy, with a revolutionary France and an excited Europe. There is nothing to show that when, by replies and letters and statements, he excited vague and uncertain hopes and expectations in Ireland, he ever gave a thought as to how all this might affect his colleagues, or their policy, or their power. There, in fine, is nothing to show that he gave much thought to his colleagues at all, or of any duty or engagement to them. He was a very upright, honourable, well-inten-

tioned, vain, rash and headstrong man, of moderate capacity, without any of the reticence, tact, or caution, which his position as the Viceroy of a troubled country in a troubled time so much required.

Fitzwilliam treated his instructions and engagements with small concern, as a something, may be, to be got rid of, but that was not to bar his progress. His instructions about the Catholic question (what remained of it after the Act of 1793) were clear and distinct—that as far as possible he was to *prevent* its being agitated that Session. If the stipulation was that he was to foment it in every shape and form, it would have more suited his acts. He at once wrote letters to Portland demanding ‘urgency’ for the question, and, not having received a reply for some weeks, he arrogated to himself the right, in face of the clear agreement and without a line to justify it, of proceeding according to his own lights. ‘It is urged by Fitzwilliam’s apologists that he considered that silence gives consent, a proverb doubtful at all times, but preposterous as a political plea; more especially absurd when it is relied on for guidance in defiance of definite instructions.’<sup>1</sup>

The Catholic question was sure, *more suo*, to turn up at some time during the session, but the question in the hands of a private member was one thing, and when undertaken by Grattan, then in the close and ostentatious confidence of the Viceroy, not only with his open and warm approval, but at his direct instance and suggestion,<sup>2</sup> was a totally different matter.

<sup>1</sup> *Pitt*, by Lord Rosebery.

<sup>2</sup> The Protest of Fitzwilliam, in the *Journal* of the House of Lords,

His conduct in reference to offices and places was equally against the whole spirit and meaning of the understanding. Nothing could justify all the changes he contemplated and attempted. If changes in some offices were clearly necessary, owing to considerations of executive efficiency or the incapacity or improper conduct of existing officials, then there might be a fair case for consideration and for action. But no such reasonable views were governing Fitzwilliam's conduct. He wanted to get rid of all the great existing officials, not because they were incapable or corrupt, but because he wished to give their places to others, seeking in all the cases to silence the victims by offering pensions of extravagant dimensions, without regard to a single consideration of economy or efficiency. The Ponsonbys were mainly to blame for this. All the correspondence of that day is full of the Ponsonbys—of the Ponsonby party, of the Ponsonby standard ; that George Ponsonby was to be Attorney-General at all events, and his brother William Secretary of State, and may be also Chief Commissioner of the Revenue, when Beresford was put out ; that the Beresfords were to be pulled down and the Ponsonbys raised up. Beresford got a polite notice to quit before Fitzwilliam had recovered from his voyage ; the two Under-Secretaries, Sackville Hamilton and Cook, were promptly commanded to go, and the two Law Officers were told to pack up and be ready.

makes this clear : 'He sent for Mr. Grattan, and desired him as a person in his confidence . . . that Mr. Grattan did consent . . . did at his desire move for leave to bring in a Bill for the further relief of the Roman Catholics.' Fitzwilliam was fond of protests ; in 1785 he protested against Pitt's commercial resolutions.

In a letter<sup>1</sup> of December 14, 1794, Lord Auckland (Eden) writes the general official and popular understanding of the position: 'I understand very positively and pointedly that the new Viceroy is not to remove any individual from office, unless for misbehaviour in office; that William Ponsonby is to be Secretary of State; that George Ponsonby is to be Attorney-General when the situation is open; that Douglas is to be in some way or another provided for; that Mr. Grattan is to be superintendent of Irish politics, but professedly on the disinterested, moderating, and conciliatory principle, and that no large or offensive change of measures is to be brought forward. My inference is that there will be great fermentation, both in the Levee rooms at the Castle and in both Houses of Parliament; that the Government will be comfortless; that you, Lord Fitzgibbon, etc., will not be comfortable; that the Ponsonby set will be restless to get a large share of patronage; that Mr. Pitt will have lost a large body of Irish friends; that the safety even of the country will be hazarded.'

Lord Fitzwilliam landed on Sunday, January 4, 1795; was ill and confined to his room for the whole of the next day (Monday); and had only had Tuesday to master all the details of his new position. Daly waited on Beresford on the next day (Wednesday) to tell him he was to go—that he was too powerful—that he was considered the King of Ireland; and therefore that he should be put out of office, but proposed that he should be given a retiring pension of £2,000 a year.

<sup>1</sup> *Beresford Correspondence*, ii. 48.

Daly was brother-in-law of the Ponsonbys, and therefore came with full authority to 'pull down the Beresfords.' But Beresford was a strong man in a strong position, who had conducted his department with honesty and ability, and he was not going to be cajoled, or bribed or bullied out of office.

He appealed through Auckland to Pitt, who at once said<sup>1</sup> that he hoped there was some mistake in the statement, 'because it would be a breach of a most solemn engagement.' Beresford utterly refused to exhibit any convenient meekness of resignation, and wrote to Auckland: 'I declare that I am an injured man; that I am turned out of office; and I will not resign. If any reason for displacing me can be produced, save only that I have supported Government, and that my office is wanted in order to be given to some other person in order to support, not Government, but the Governours of Government, I am ready to resign.'

Auckland replied<sup>2</sup> to Beresford that, 'if it were possible to come to a decisive explanation on this subject it would have been done at the moment; but the state of the country, under the accumulation of calamity and danger, is such that management is necessary from every principle of public duty. It is wonderful that at such a crisis Lord Fitzwilliam can lend his name to an indecent, cruel and unjust course of jobbing, contrary also to what was understood by a most solemn promise.'

<sup>1</sup> *Beresford Correspondence*, ii. 53, Lord Auckland to Beresford.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Auckland to Beresford, January 16, 1795.

Lord Milton, on January 16, wrote a formal letter of dismissal to Beresford, saying that a new Commission for the Board of Revenue was about to be issued, and that his name would not be included, ‘but His Excellency, having taken into account your long and laborious attendance in the office of First Commissioner of the Board, will on the new arrangement being approved by His Majesty, signify his orders to place £2,000 a year, being the amount of your present salary, amongst the “incidental charges” of the Revenue.’ Beresford simply acknowledged the receipt of the letter and took no notice of the offer of a pension. The transaction was rash and ill considered. If Beresford was on the merits entitled to a pension equal to his salary, he was entitled to keep his place and not be dismissed, being in possession of all his powers; and if he was not entitled by honest and able service, it was an effort by a job to make another place vacant, destined, as was said, to be held by William Ponsonby along with the office of Secretary of State.

But the Ponsonbys should have let Beresford alone. They should have known their man better. On January 19 Beresford wrote<sup>1</sup> to Auckland: ‘The folly of Mr. Ponsonby’s declarations is extraordinary. To me Mr. Daly declared that I was considered King of Ireland, and at Lord Shannon’s dinner, after he had gone away and a sufficient quantity of wine had been drunk, Ponsonby declared that he had been long struggling for power, that he had got the reins in his hands, and would use them. At Parnell’s dinner, seven

<sup>1</sup> *Beresford Correspondence*, ii. 59, January 19, 1795.

of them sat till one o'clock and got drunk. Sir John got into an argument, and swore that they never did so foolish a thing as turn me out, and was pleased to speak of me as an efficient and honest servant of the Crown. Ponsonby replied that he acknowledged what he said, and spoke handsomely of *me*, and concluded thus : “ Had I, however, allowed him to remain in office, how could the whole power of the country have been put into my hands.” He then told them that he never would have come into office if he had not brought over Lord Fitzwilliam with him, and that even then they would not have undertaken it if they had not had a Secretary of State to correspond with who would do as they pleased.’

Grattan, in February, moved for leave to bring in a Bill for the repeal of all laws in any manner affecting Catholics. The notice was in such general terms that it might have included anything, and Lord Fitzgibbon, writing<sup>1</sup> to Beresford on March 2, 1795, says : ‘ This day I heard that Mr. Grattan’s Bill had been sent to England—I presume to endeavour, if possible, to remove the difficulties which have arisen there. What his Bill may be I know not, but sure I am that to carry his project into execution he must repeal the Act of Supremacy, the Test Act, the Act of Uniformity, the Bill of Rights, and the Act limiting the succession to the Crown ; and I do not think it requires any very great degree of sagacity to see that the King<sup>2</sup> cannot give

<sup>1</sup> *Beresford Correspondence*, ii. 75.

<sup>2</sup> There is a curious reference to Fitzgibbon’s views on this subject, and his possible communications with George III., in a letter of Portland to Pelham, March 21, 1795 (*Pelham Papers*, British Museum) : ‘I cannot

his assent to a repeal of any of them in this country without a breach of his Coronation Oath and a direct violation of the Articles of Union with Scotland.'

The Bill was discountenanced by the Cabinet, and Lord Fitzwilliam had been told<sup>1</sup> officially that 'by delaying the Catholic question till the peace he might render a greater service to the empire at large than any it had received since the Revolution.' But he would not act upon the directions and advice of his colleagues. He was in frequent and close communication with Grattan, and from his own Protest it appears he directed and encouraged his action.

The view of the Cabinet, though Pitt was strongly for the Catholics, appears to have been that in the midst of a terrible war, straining all the resources of the empire, it was a grave step to make a radical change in the constitution of the Irish Parliament. If in its new formation it proved itself hostile to the policy of Great Britain in the great struggle then going on in Europe, it

but inform you, for the purpose of putting you upon your guard, that we have heard from the most unquestionable authority that a correspondence has been carried on, or at least letters have been written by Lord Fitzgibbon to the King (to whom they have been delivered by Lord Westmoreland), with a view, and with more effect than could be wished, to prejudice his mind and to alarm his conscience against the concession to the Catholics. I don't know how *your friend* Pitt feels this, but if this is to be the practice no Government can go on in Ireland, and I believe there are not two opinions in the greater part of the Cabinet respecting it.' The Duke could not have known that at the very same time the Lord Chancellor of England, Lord Loughborough, had submitted to the King his views, all in the same direction as Lord Clare's, in a careful memorandum, entitled, by George III. himself: 'Thoughts on the Emancipation of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, and dangers arising from granting them' (Campbell's *Lives of the Lord Chancellors*, viii. 172).

<sup>1</sup> *Beresford Correspondence*, ii. 87.

might cripple the Empire in its emergency, and defeat its efforts in what it believed to be the needful imperial policy. On the other side, it was urged the fears were groundless, or, in any event, *Fiat justitia ruat cælum*, throw open the doors of the Irish Parliament to all; Parliament was made independent in 1782: you must trust it to do what it thinks right; if it agrees with Great Britain, the Cabinet would have no grievance, and if it differs—why, it has a right to differ. But till the end of time statesmen will consider expediency and the prudence of occasions; and it is plain from their action that the Cabinet did not want, in the midst of all their urgent foreign troubles, to have to face possible complications resulting from what might be a radical change in the constitution of the Irish Parliament, and they wished to postpone the matter until after the peace.

The Catholic Committee in 1792 had disclaimed seeking the admission of any but Protestants to Parliament; they only sought to give the Catholic forty-shilling freeholders the franchise when they possessed besides a much larger qualification, so as to avoid the complete swamping of the existing voters. The Relief Act of 1793, in addition to its own ameliorating provisions, gave the franchise without the suggested qualification to all Catholic forty-shilling freeholders, so that in the greater part of Ireland they already wielded great power. When the Relief Act of 1829 was passed, O'Connell had to consent to an enactment disfranchising the forty-shilling freeholders and raising the franchise to ten pounds. Whether, if the Catholics

realised their great power under the Act of 1793, they would have remained satisfied to return docile Protestants, amenable to the traditions and management of English statecraft, it may not be easy to say. The change was then in its infancy, and political knowledge then worked slowly; but if, in addition to the vast change in the electorate, there was also to be a wide alteration in the power of selecting those who should represent them, political foresight or anxiety might suggest possibilities of a radical change in the constitution of the Irish Parliament, its ways, its methods, and its points of view. As it was, it had sometimes been found difficult to get the Irish Parliament to work in harmony with English views of Imperial interests. It might be found impossible if a large change were made; and in the midst of a war, that might be one of life and death, it was not desired to encourage these home questions that might disturb and derange the consistent and united action of the two Parliaments. Enlightened public opinion generations ago expressed itself in favour of Catholic emancipation, and regretted its delay; but Pitt in 1795, though most friendly to the Catholics, surveying the position at home and abroad, thought the time ill-chosen, and wished for a postponement until after the peace.

The end came rapidly, but hardly quick enough, for every day Fitzwilliam remained in Ireland he did more harm. On February 8, 1795, Portland warned Fitzwilliam to give no encouragement to the Catholics. On

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*

the 9th Pitt himself censured the attempted dismissal of Beresford.

A few days after, Portland wrote a confidential despatch, expressing strong disapproval of *at that time* attempting emancipation. Among Pitt's papers<sup>1</sup> is a draft of a letter to Fitzwilliam, which must have been written and sent that month :

I must remark that though your lordship at different times mentioned apprehensions of Mr. Beresford's supposed influence and power, from ideas which I always conceived to be mistaken, no intention was to my recollection ever hinted at, even in the most distant manner, of proposing his removal from the Revenue Board, much less of doing so without his consent. Indeed, if a change in so perpetual an office had been in your contemplation, it would certainly have been mentioned at the meeting here, at which all the other official arrangements which you thought of were discussed. And certainly if it had been mentioned Lord Grenville and I should have stated it as in itself liable to the strongest objections (instead of considering it as an object fit to be purchased at so dear a rate as an additional burden of 2,000*l.* a year to the public), particularly from its being inconsistent with that principle of protection to the servants of Government which we conceived you to have adopted, and by which alone the full advantages of the union which had taken place here could be extended to Ireland. While all these general considerations press themselves on my mind, you will not wonder that I cannot help also feeling it as a circumstance of some additional weight in this particular instance that the change which has thus been announced would never take effect but by a direct authority from hence, and that under the signature of the Lords of the Treasury. . . . All these arrangements, if they were to take place, would carry no impression to the public but that of a studied and immediate change in almost all the principal departments.

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*

Fitzwilliam then wrote a long letter<sup>1</sup> to Pitt on February 14, 1795, mentioning Catholic claims, and all the controversy about Beresford, and then demanding that Pitt and the Cabinet should choose between Beresford and him. His words were bold and manly: ‘Upon these and every other measure which I have submitted to you and my other colleagues, you now know my decided opinion, and the rules by which my conduct will be directed. If they are not such as to entitle me to a cordial and unequivocal support of the Cabinet, recall me; these are not times for the fate of the empire to be trifled with. There must be harmony and mutual co-operation among those to whom so much is entrusted, and I will deliver over the country in the best state I can to any person who possesses more of your confidence, and whose representations both as to men and measures will be more relied upon.’

On February 21, 1795, Pitt wrote to him a courteous but positive letter:<sup>2</sup>

Downing Street: Feb. 21, 1795.

My dear Lord,—After the sentiments contained in my last letter on the subject of the different official arrangements, and the communication of the opinion of Government respecting the Catholic question which you have received from the Duke of Portland, you will easily judge of the pain with which I have learnt your determination as stated in your letter to me of the 12th, and in your despatch by the same messenger. With respect to the present state of the Catholic question refer to the despatches from the Duke of Portland, in the sentiments of which I entirely concur, and which must make me anxious that all who wish well to the interests of Government should join in preventing any further progress being made in Mr. Grattan’s Bill till we have received and considered the information which

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

we have thought it our duty to call for. With respect to arrangements, I need only add that I feel myself bound to adhere to the sentiments which I have stated, not only with respect to Mr. Beresford but to the line of conduct adopted in so many instances towards the former supporters of Government. By these sentiments I must be guided, from a regard to the King and my own honour, however sincerely I lament the consequence which your lordship has announced must result from the present situation.

I have the honour, etc.

W. Pitt.

Fitzwilliam was thus recalled in the month of February, 1795, and the absolute necessity for this strong step must have been very clear when it commanded the full concurrence of Fitzwilliam's own special political allies, Portland, Spencer, and Windham. The plain truth is, it was a mistake ever to have selected him, and a greater mistake still to have allowed him to go to Ireland after he had by his rash and precipitate language shown his thorough unfitness for the Vice-royalty.

Even in the circumstances of his going away, he showed his imprudence. He was strongly advised to go away quietly, so as to avoid risk of rioting, advice in which O'Beirne<sup>1</sup> joined, but he preferred the 'pride, pomp, and circumstance' of a full Viceregal function, and left in due state on March 25.

The occurrence caused much anxiety to the Govern-

<sup>1</sup> O'Beirne was apprehensive of riot, but said that, 'upon deliberation, His Excellency's friends were of opinion, if it took place, it could not be laid at his door.' Lord Milton appears to have become nervous upon the subject, and he tried to stop the Gazette notice. (*Beresford Correspondence*, ii. 85.) See Clare's two letters of March 1795 in the *Westmoreland Papers*, Dublin Castle.

ment, and the Duke of Portland said that Pitt and Windham were full of apprehension and gloom at the meeting of March 28. Portland appears a month before to have been anxious to smooth the position by obtaining the King's leave for Fitzwilliam's 'continuing to attend Cabinet meetings on his return from Ireland.' George III. wrote at once to Pitt on February 22, 1795,<sup>1</sup> 'I therefore authorise Mr. Pitt to acquaint him [Fitzwilliam] with the suggestion having been laid before me, with my cordial consent, though I doubt much whether Earl Fitzwilliam is in a state of mind to accept it.' It does not appear that the offer was ever made, and there is no reason to think it would have been accepted. It is manifest that Ministers thought the whole question a very delicate one: they were most unwilling to make an attack on Fitzwilliam, and they defended his recall by putting forward the prerogative right of the Sovereign to change his servants.<sup>2</sup>

On April 22, 1795, Fitzwilliam addressed a long, verbose, tedious, letter<sup>3</sup> to the King, giving himself

<sup>1</sup> Stanhope's *Life of Pitt*.

<sup>2</sup> The whole question was fully discussed at the time. No end of essays, letters, and pamphlets were published on the subject. It was debated both in College Green and at Westminster. In May 1795 the Duke of Norfolk moved for the correspondence between the Ministers and Fitzwilliam relating to the motives and grounds of his recall at the particular time it took place. Lord Fitzwilliam spoke at length, and the motion was rejected. Mr. Jekyll, supported by Fox, moved a similar motion in the House of Commons, which was resisted by Pitt, who moved the order of the day, which was carried by 183 to 43. (Adolphus, *History of England*, vol. vi. ch. 92; *Parliamentary History*, vol. v. ch. 31, pp. 1531-50).

<sup>3</sup> *Prettyman MSS.* It is interesting to bear in mind that Pitt, in his schemes for a combined Administration, in May 1804 included the name of Fitzwilliam as a Secretary of State, with Lord Melville and Fox.

infinite praise for his honesty, insight, and promptitude, as contrasted with the machinations of Ministers ; explaining his desire for the rigorous prosecution of the war ; putting forward his wishes for the Catholics, asserting that Ministers had agreed in the principles of a Bill for quieting the Catholics. The King sent the letter to Pitt, with the following letter :<sup>1</sup>

Queen's House : April 29, 1795.

I think it right to communicate to Mr. Pitt the accompanying paper delivered to me by the Earl Fitzwilliam. I neither desire it may be shown to the Cabinet Ministers, nor do I put any importance that it should not be produced if Mr. Pitt thinks it right. When he has done with it I desire it may be returned. I cannot say much information is to be obtained from it. It seems rather a panegyric on himself than any pointed attack on Ministry, though it shows much disinclination to former colleagues, and an insinuation that peace is thought of, which he cannot more firmly disapprove of than myself ; but I am certain the whole Cabinet coincide with me in that sentiment.

GEORGE R.

One of Fitzwilliam's greatest friends was Lord Carlisle, who had been Viceroy in 1780–2. They had been intimate from boyhood, and they had all through life the greatest affection and regard for one another. Carlisle having heard of his doings in Ireland, and of the alarm they excited, wrote a frank and manly letter to Fitzwilliam :<sup>2</sup>

This may have been to conciliate Fox, who was Fitzwilliam's great friend.

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*

<sup>2</sup> Lord Fitzwilliam's correspondence with Lord Carlisle is printed at length in the recent volume of the *Hist. MSS. Com.; Papers of Lord Carlisle*, p. 708, *et seq.* Fitzwilliam's two principal letters to Carlisle have been published for years, and may also be found in the *Beresford Correspondence*. They were at once printed and circulated at Fitzwilliam's instance.

*Lord Carlisle to Lord Fitzwilliam.*

Feb. 27, 1795.

The critical situation in which we conceive you are now standing, both as to your own reputation and the general well-being of the two countries, cannot fail of giving those interested as I am for everything that concerns you the most serious alarm.

We fear things are come to that extremity that the stopping short or abandoning a system perhaps too hastily adopted may, from the quickness of your feelings, become a difficulty not easy for you to surmount ; and yet, with a mind as pure as yours, we cannot reconcile your persisting in those measures which the nearest of your political connexions consider as most fatal to the interests of both England and Ireland ; or that, sooner than renounce them, you would quit the condition which the public so much rejoiced you undertook.

Before you decide upon the last step, of such serious importance to yourself and to us all, 'tis an honest duty I discharge when I boldly expose to you that opinion which I think prevails generally in the world as to your actual situation.

It has become a general belief, perhaps because it was a general hope amongst all your friends, that no material measures as to *things* or *persons* were to be concerted or done without the concurrence of Mr. Pitt, always looking towards him as *the Prime Minister*, and that the project of hastily removing men who had not sinned against your administration had been abandoned, as founded neither in policy nor justice. This belief has obtained to that degree in the public mind so as to make it everywhere publicly asserted that it was upon these *arranged points* you took your decision to embark. Of this you must know the truth. If the world is in an error, I must prepare you to meet that error.

Under these impressions, you will not wonder at our surprise and dismay at seeing your list of dismissals, for offences, if committed, not marked at the time by those against whose government they were committed with the punishment they might be supposed to merit. But it is with something more

than surprise we perceive those most connected with the Castle (before you have had time to judge with your own understanding) precipitately open measures which I protest to God, knowing something of Ireland, I cannot a moment contemplate without terror, nor, indeed, pretend to pursue their enormous consequences.

All this seems so contradictory to that plan which we were taught to believe was to obtain for the good understanding between the Governments of both countries, and without which most serious calamities—at this hour particularly—may arise to both, that in truth we are lost in affliction and consternation. If you cannot recede, which God forbid, you must prepare to meet a very general opinion on this side of the water that your advisers have been hasty, violent, and precipitate; that they have hurried you to the adoption of measures which could not have had the previous approbation of the Ministers here, or subsequently obtain their concurrence. And yet there is another opinion, equally general, that from your known integrity and honour your first consideration will be, whatever it may cost your feelings, to embarrass as little as possible the present Government at home, and that if you should entertain thoughts of return you could personally omit no sacrifice that might tend to the ease and practicable rule of your successor.

Carlisle and Fitzwilliam had been boys together at Eton, been always close and warm allies, and the whole letter shows an earnest desire to convey opinions that needed to be known in the kindest and most considerate manner—entirely free from the unpleasant tone of a candid friend.

Fitzwilliam wrote in reply, as is well known, two very long letters<sup>1</sup> seeking to justify his removals from office and his attitude on the Catholic question.

<sup>1</sup> The first is dated March 6, 1795, and the second March 23, 1795, both from Dublin Castle. (*Beresford Correspondence; Hist. MSS. Com.*, 15th Rep., App., part 6, *Lord Carlisle's Papers*.)

At the close of the second letter he asserts that Pitt did not really object to his measures or his removals, and that his action was to be ascribed to dislike : 'To my measures Mr. Pitt has no objection : I predict that he will adopt them through the medium of my successor. I am not sure that he will not even court the connections I have formed for Government. For the person for whom he has pretended to contend so strenuously he has no regard ; and I doubt whether he will even permit him to resume his station at the Revenue Board, though he is entitled to do it, even without a reappointment, for, in fact, he has never been out of office. To get rid then of me personally, and thereby to consign me over to immediate disgrace, has been the motive of everything that has happened relative to Ireland. I have then the glory of being the object of Mr. Pitt's dislike.'

Carlisle, on April 14, 1795, replied<sup>1</sup> to Fitzwilliam in a gentle and kindly letter, unmistakably, however, showing that he thought the latter was wrong on all points. Carlisle had written his first letter in full confidence to his friend, to warn him of the state of public opinion. Fitzwilliam had sought to make his replies a public statement of his position as to both measures and men. Carlisle, in his letter of April 14, seeks all through to keep before Fitzwilliam's eyes that he had written and was then writing as a friend to a friend. Affection and forbearance are shown in every line :

A friendship which commenced in the earliest period of

<sup>1</sup> *Beresford Correspondence*, ii. 94; *Hist. MSS Com.*, *Lord Carlisle's Papers*, p. 723.

youth, and which I trust will only cease with the termination of life, would readily supply sufficient excuse for heavier difficulties than those imposed on me owing to the two letters you addressed to me, in answer to mine of February 27, finding their way to the inspection of the public. It is not easy for me to guess what idea the public may have formed of that letter, which has produced such copious answers from you, and seemed to force you to a justification beyond the limits of a secret and confidential correspondence.

In turning to that letter, I think you will perceive nothing, besides my zeal for your welfare and interest, which could have prompted me to the communication and disclosure of such opinions of the opening of your administration as I was enabled to gather, and to which (however erroneously or correctly conceived) it appeared to me you ought not to have remained a stranger. . . . I stated to you that a general belief prevailed that in your final arrangements and concluding conversation with His Majesty's Ministers, at which others assisted, it was settled that no material measure either as to *persons* or *things* was to be concerted or decided upon without further communication with and concurrence of the Cabinet of England. . . . In Mr. Pitt's endeavour to hold up a shield to shelter persons who had merited the favour of the last Lord-Lieutenant by their services, and on whose conduct no blame or censure had attached, I can only perceive an instance of firmness and justice; and surely it requires explanation to convince plain and impartial men that such removals, taking the mode, time, and provocation, were not at least a seeming departure from the amicable dealing towards the Prime Minister which we at a distance were taught to hope and believe was to mark the junction of your party to Mr. Pitt. . . . In many parts of your letter, if I mistake not, it may be collected that, owing to the circumstances of the times, the pressure of business produced by the war, and the necessity of pointing all thought, as well as all exertion, towards the defence of the Empire, it was a general wish to postpone the consideration of the merits of the Roman Catholic question for a moment better fitted for a less interrupted investigation of it. . . . May I, my dear friend, be permitted

to say that, weighing every part of this subject in the most dispassionate and impartial manner I am able, I never heard the sound of accusation of your conduct in any quarter, perceived no attack aimed at your character, no stain endeavoured to be fixed upon your reputation, no abandonment of private friendship or affection, no wretched symptoms of that refined dissimulation you fancy you have detected. . . . I have been obliged, thus tediously, to trespass on your patience, an apology for which can only be looked for and found in that friendship I before alluded to, and which has, for so many years, taught us indulgence for each other.

Fitzwilliam was plainly anxious, from some passages in his letters, that they should be by no means kept private. At the close of his first letter he had said :— ‘I wish that you will show it to as many persons as you shall think proper,’ and he would appear to have himself done everything to make it public. Carlisle showed it to the King, who wrote:<sup>1</sup> ‘I have not the smallest doubt that the same good intentions that dictated the Earl of Carlisle’s letter will point out the propriety of trying to set an honourable man right, whose heat certainly has prevented him from attending to the false reasoning that prevails in the whole statement of his narrative.’

He also showed it to the Chancellor, Lord Loughborough, who wrote the following important reply :<sup>2</sup>

‘It is difficult to express the concern I feel from Lord F.’s letter: having laboured with the truest zeal to remove the obstacles to his appointment, and confident in the apparent success of my endeavours, the disappointment affects me more peculiarly. All subjects of dissension I thought were removed

<sup>1</sup> March 22, 1795 (*Hist. MSS. Com., Lord Carlisle’s Papers*, p. 713, 15th Rep., App., part 6).

<sup>2</sup> March 15, 1795 (*ib.* p. 712).

by the explanation which took place at the meeting between Mr. Grattan and Mr. Burke and myself, and was afterwards confirmed by Lord F. The copy of the note made at the time will show how far my expectation was well founded, that as to the arrangement of places at least there could not be much embarrassment after the principles which were to govern that arrangement had been so fully admitted.

What passed here as to the detail of offices, I am totally ignorant; from the apparent good humours on all sides I had no doubt that it was all settled by an amicable concert, and it was indifferent to me how it was settled. But upon the statement in Lord F.'s letter, I am obliged to say that he has not kept in his view the terms of his explanation. If he in Ireland was to make an Attorney-General against Mr. Pitt's consent, and a Solicitor-General without his knowledge, there could be nothing more opposite to the idea of settling offices here by amicable concert, or of Mr. Pitt's being considered as the Minister, or of supporting in Ireland the English Administration.

As to the subject of Beresford's place, which has acquired an importance that I am sure your lordship must think does not belong to it, the mode of conducting that and some other removals seemed to mark, and by Lord F.'s letter was intended to mark to the public, a reprobation of the late Government of Ireland, which surely could never be supposed to be the result of an amicable concert here without disgracing the English Administration and destroying all future confidence amongst its supporters in Ireland.

The Catholic question, which is of far greater moment than all the rest, was never discussed upon its merits at any meeting where I was present. . . . How this unfortunate business may end I cannot conjecture, especially as it appears that Lord F. is yet too narrow to discuss it fairly, and no pains will be spared to keep him in this temper.

The 'explanation' referred to is of the highest importance. A copy in Lord Loughborough's handwriting was enclosed to Lord Carlisle, and is set

out<sup>1</sup> amongst the manuscripts of Lord Carlisle printed by the Historical Manuscripts Commission in the exact form following :

Explanation settled between Mr. Grattan and Mr. Burke, coming from Lord F. and the Chancellor.

(1795, March).<sup>2</sup> They stated that Lord F.'s view was 'To support in Ireland the English Government, considering Mr. Pitt as the *Prime Minister*, without whom no material measure as to *things or persons* is to be concerted or done—not setting up a Government of Departments, but that each department acting under him should meet with its due and honourable support from him.'

'No vindictive removals; those which may be necessary for convenience to be settled *here* by amicable concert.'

'Misrepresentations and indiscretions may have had effect on both sides; to wipe away all memory of them, and to start as on new ground. To arrange, in the best manner for the interest of both Kingdoms, the state of Ireland for this purpose.'

The above words were settled in the course of the conversation. After Mr. Grattan and Mr. Burke had left him, the Chancellor added the following note :

This from Lord F. and understated; he is ready and *desirous* to state it more fully himself.

The Chancellor thought it necessary for him to see Lord Fitzwilliam himself, which he did the following day, in the presence of Mr. Grattan. The note was fully considered in all its parts, and Lord F. made no objection or remark, except that in the memorandum added by the Chancellor he observed the word '*willing*' would have been more exact than *desirous* in *Lord Loughborough's hand*.

<sup>1</sup> P. 722, *Hist. MSS. Com.*, 15th Rep., App., part 6.

<sup>2</sup> This date is presumably inserted as the probable date of the copy made by Loughborough, and transmitted by him to Carlisle. The date of the 'explanation' itself may be assumed to be before Fitzwilliam went to Ireland.

It is obvious that the importance and significance of this ‘explanation’ can hardly be over-estimated. Grattan and Burke, as well as Fitzwilliam, were parties to it, and, as far as it goes, it is in substantial accord with the broad outlines of the understanding drawn up by Pitt, and expanded in detail in the memorandum of March 28, 1795. It is plain that Fitzwilliam departed from the explanation as freely as he did from the understanding stated in the memorandum.<sup>1</sup> He seems to have been incapable of realising the binding nature of such obligations.

In leaving Ireland Fitzwilliam did not get rid of Beresford, or the consequences of his own intemperate action and language. In his letters to Carlisle he had rashly spoken most disparagingly of Beresford, and in his letter<sup>2</sup> of March 6 he had actually written: ‘But when on my arrival here all these apprehensions of his dangerous power, which Mr. Pitt admits I had often represented to him were fully justified, when he was filling a position greater than that of the Lord-Lieutenant himself, and when I clearly saw that if I had connected myself with him it would have been connecting myself with a person labouring under heavy suspicions and subjecting my Government to all the opprobrium and unpopularity attendant upon his maladministration,

<sup>1</sup> See *Grattan's Memoirs*, vol. iv., by his son. Loughborough’s letter to Grattan, February 28, 1795, refers to ‘the very clear explanation settled between us and Mr. Burke. . . . Nothing left unexplained and unsettled at time of Lord-Lieutenant’s departure.’ This is a very cautious letter—not in favour of Fitzwilliam. Burke’s letters to Grattan also suggest a strong desire to let Fitzwilliam know what was said.

<sup>2</sup> *Beresford Correspondence*, ii. 78; *Hist. MSS. Com., Lord Carlisle's Papers*.

what was then my choice, what the decision I had to form? I could not hesitate a moment. I decided at once not to cloud the dawn of my administration by leaving in such power and authority so much imputed malversation.'

There could be no uglier stab given to the character of a Chief Commissioner of the Revenue, with all the deadliness of general words, not specific or distinct, but utterly destructive to character. The letter was not intended to remain secret. Fitzwilliam took steps to make its contents known, and thus indeed, if his charge was well founded, give to his dismissal high moral authority.

There was not the vestige of foundation for the scandalous suggestions of malversation so recklessly put forward by Fitzwilliam, and Beresford, justly indignant, at once took counsel with his friends. Fitzgibbon was characteristically clear. He advised Beresford to bring an action, and said :<sup>1</sup>

One broad fact must damn him on this subject for ever. He landed here on Sunday evening, and was confined to his room by indisposition for the whole of the next day. On Wednesday Mr. Bowes Daly was sent to you, so that he had one day only to enquire into the multiplied acts of malversation which he alleges against you, and his justification for wishing to

<sup>1</sup> *Beresford Correspondence*, ii. 88: Lord Fitzgibbon to Beresford, March 26, 1795. In the *Auckland Papers* at the British Museum, Beresford, in a letter to Lord Auckland (34, 453, and 237), says: 'The accusation is against me, as a Commissioner of Wide Streets, that I persuaded the Board to let the ground (for the Custom House) to a Mr. Ottiwell under the value, and that I had an interest in so doing. An enquiry was instituted in the Lords; the Committee have sat now the third session and every tittle of evidence has disproved what was insinuated.'

remove you. He also takes occasion to accuse you of duplicity to Mr. Pitt. How he will be able to justify his flagrant breaches of public duty and private faith<sup>1</sup> in publishing a passage of most grave and serious import, contained in a private and confidential despatch received by him from the Duke of Portland—how he will be able to answer it to the British Ministry, whilst he was actually Lord-Lieutenant, issuing a manifesto to the good people of this country recommending to them to pursue a measure of his which had been condemned unanimously by the English Cabinet, and for which he was, in his own phrase, deposed—how he will answer it to that Government to proclaim to the good people of Ireland that the supplies voted by the Parliament were the stipulated price of that measure, and that the discontent arising from his recall will be repressed only by arms, is to be determined on his arrival in England. In his expectation of commotion most certainly he will be disappointed.

The illness and subsequent death of his wife, and also his desire to leave ample time to have the affairs of his department fully criticised and examined, prevented Beresford from at once pressing Lord Fitzwilliam for an explanation or retraction of his words, but on June 22 he did so in a manly and dignified letter. Lord Fitzwilliam wrote in reply that he could not allow any person whatever to charge his statements with falsity. No arrangement having been come to, a duel was agreed on, which Beresford fully describes in the following letter<sup>2</sup> to Lord Buckingham :

<sup>1</sup> This was also Pitt's view. Bishop Tomline, writing to his wife that year, says: 'Mr. Pitt told me at breakfast that Lord F. had been guilty of a greater breach of official secrecy than he ever knew any man before. He has given forty to fifty copies of a paper in which was an extract from the most private possible despatches relative to the very critical state of Ireland' (*Prettyman MSS.*).

<sup>2</sup> *Beresford Correspondence.*

July 6, 1795.

My dear Lord,—You had not left town half an hour when I called at your house, wishing to have stated to you what had passed between Lord Fitzwilliam and me. . . . In consequence of what had passed, I thought it necessary to call upon Lord Fitzwilliam either to disavow or to explain in a proper manner the expressions he had made use of in the letters to Lord Carlisle, published in his name. . . . In his answer he avows the paragraphs I quoted, but denies they were published by his discretion, at his desire, or with his privity, and adds that he will not permit anyone to charge them with falsity, and says he will come to town in a few days, and desires me to stay for him. . . . This answer is dated June 23, and I heard not a word from him until eight o'clock on Sunday morning, the 28th, when Lord George Cavendish<sup>1</sup> called upon me. He told me he was sorry to come upon so disagreeable a business, but Lord Fitzwilliam had come to town, and was then in a hackney coach in the neighbourhood, and ready to obey my call. . . .

Lord George and Sir George Montgomery<sup>2</sup> went out together to fix a place of meeting: while they were doing this, Lord George asked if they could not interfere. Sir George said that they might if Lord Fitzwilliam would make an apology. Lord George said that he would make any he could with propriety. Sir George returned to me, and we got into a coach and followed directly. When we came to the ground, the treaty was renewed, and drafts of an apology were drawn, which were not satisfactory to me. This took up time, during which a number of people gathered round us, suspecting what we were about. I doubt not there were fifty. We therefore were obliged to get into my coach and drive off. We went through Paddington

<sup>1</sup> Lord George Cavendish, second son of William, fourth Duke of Devonshire, and Lady Charlotte Boyle, daughter of Richard, third Earl of Burlington. Born 1754; M.P. for the County of Derby; created, 1831, Earl of Burlington; married, 1782, Lady Elizabeth Compton, daughter of Charles, seventh Earl of Northampton; died 1834.

<sup>2</sup> Sir George Montgomery, second son of Sir William Montgomery; half brother to Mrs. Beresford; M.P. for Peeblesshire; succeeded as Baronet 1783; died 1831.

about a mile and a half, and went into another field. They made one attempt more at an apology, which would not answer, and then Sir George measured the ground, dropping a glove where he set out and another where he stopped. I went directly to the latter with my pistol, and his lordship was walking to the former, and within two yards of it, when a magistrate called out to him by name, ‘Lord Fitzwilliam, I desire you will keep the peace. I am a magistrate !’

His lordship turned about much agitated, when he was arrested, and his pistol taken from him. I then walked to them, and gave my pistol to Sir George. Lord Fitzwilliam then turned to me, and said: ‘Now, Mr. Beresford, that we have been prevented from finishing this business in the manner I wished, I have no scruple to make an apology,’ which he did, and hoped it would be satisfactory to me. Having said as much as it was possible for him to say, and having assured me that the letters were never meant for publication, he then repeated for the press, but only to be shown to those friends who Lord Carlisle mentioned to have conceived certain opinions of his conduct, that the expressions which he used arose from impressions he had received from those he conversed with, and were not intended to injure or relate to my private character. And considering that it was he that called on me for the expressions in my letter to him, which he acknowledged in his answer to me of the 23rd, but which expressions he never mentioned then, or requested my apology for, I thought it right to accept of his apology to me, and put an end to the business. I therefore said, as matters stood, I should accept his apology. He then hoped I would give him my hand, which I did, and he said: ‘Now, thank God, there is a complete end to my Irish administration’ ; and said something civil, purporting that he hoped that we should meet again on more pleasant terms. . . .

Your faithful and obedient servant,

J. BERESFORD.

One cannot but feel on reading this letter that Lord Fitzwilliam was an honourable gentleman, who had been led into an untenable position, from which false pride at

first prevented him from receding, but from which at last he extricated himself by an apology, creditable to his upright character, but which makes it very difficult to defend the unjust dismissal from which all the difficulties flowed.

Fitzwilliam acted so hastily, having given himself no time to investigate or deliberate, was so blinded by his own vain desire to start a new system, and so much under the influence of the Ponsonbys, that he left himself no defence sufficient to justify the dismissals. It would have been perfectly legitimate for him to give George Ponsonby high legal office, subject to the conditions agreed on, and to make such changes, after due investigation, in other offices, as he might think the public service required. But, off hand, to make sweeping dismissals without being able to make or suggest a single charge against any of the officials, and to try to silence them and their friends by giving them pensions equal to their salaries—to seek, as in Beresford's case, to throw in a charge of malversation to give colour to the transaction, was wholly indefensible. What was the good of demanding the purification of the pension list if the commencement was to be made by the offer of monstrous, indefensible and illegal pensions? What was the good of thanking God that he was not as other men were, when he did the very things that other men had done?

The Attorney-General to be got rid of was Wolfe,<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wolfe—the Right Hon. Arthur Wolfe, born 1739; called to the Bar 1766; Solicitor-General 1787, Attorney 1789; succeeded Lord Clonmel as Chief Justice 1798; M.P., 1783–98 created, 1798, Viscount Kilwarden murdered in Emmet's outbreak, 1803.

afterwards Lord Kilwarden. To use Fitzwilliam's own words in his letter to Carlisle already referred to: 'The great question was to make an easy and honourable retreat for the Attorney-General. That retreat was secured for him in the fullest meaning and intent of expression, unless it can be said that a reversion for himself and his son of £2,300 a year, and that daily augmenting, a peerage for his family, and an assurance on my part that, although removed from the immediate pretensions of his office, he still remained a person in my contemplation to fill the first vacancy of a Chief Justice seat, was not an easy and honourable retreat.' If part of Fitzwilliam's mission was to get rid of jobbing, reversions of great salaries and traffic in peerages, it is hard to conceive a more unfortunate commencement, or one more entirely opposed to the agreement with his colleagues.

O'Beirne, the private secretary, was, within a few weeks after his arrival, appointed by Fitzwilliam Bishop of Ossory. His subsequent career was not undistinguished, but all that the public at the time knew was that he was the private secretary of the new Lord-Lieutenant, who was screaming 'Excelsior,' and that it was very great and rapid promotion under such circumstances. Private secretaries are sometimes lucky, and O'Beirne was certainly very lucky. He got for a few weeks' service an elevation denied to the genius of Swift and to the eloquence of Kirwan.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Grattan said of Kirwan: 'The curse of Swift was upon him—to have been born an Irishman, and a man of genius, and to have used it for the good of his country.' Sir Jonah Barrington (*Sketches of His Own Times*, i. 426) says of Kirwan: 'He pronounced one of the most

It is ludicrous in the face of facts to speak of Fitzwilliam's displacements with high-sounding platitudes. Throughout, Fitzwilliam was *engineered* by the Ponsonbys; he was used as a means of replacing or seeking to replace one set of officials by another—possibly not worse, certainly not better.

Fitzwilliam must be held responsible for his own failure and his own recall. But it is impossible not to feel a sympathy for him. He was upright, honourable, sincere, with very excellent intentions; but he was vain, impulsive, headstrong, and rash, without prudence or reserve, unacquainted with the methods of public life, and unfortunate in being so much swayed by the Ponsonbys. He should have abandoned the whole enterprise when his colleagues sought to bind him by a compact which he should have seen he had estopped himself from obeying. One must give due credit to his loyal devotion to the Catholics—which blinded him to the considerations of time and occasion by which he was bound. On the patronage mistakes, the Ponsonbys must, very largely, share the criticism. Fitzwilliam thought—no doubt eloquent orations I ever heard from the members of any profession at any era. His manner of preaching was of the French school; he was vehement for a while, and then, becoming (or affecting to become) exhausted, he held his handkerchief to his face. A dead silence ensued—he had skill to perceive the precise moment to recommence—another blaze of declamation burst upon the congregation, and another fit of exhaustion was succeeded by another pause. The men began to wonder at his eloquence; the women grew nervous at his denunciations. His tact rivalled his talent; and at the conclusion of one of his finest sentences, a “celestial exhaustion” (as I heard a lady call it) not unfrequently terminated his discourse—in general abruptly. Kirwan in the Pulpit, Curran at the Bar, and Sheridan in the Senate, were the three most effective orators I ever recollect in their respective departments.’

mistakenly, with Pitt's strong statement supported by the recollection of his colleagues on the other side—that he had got some kind of tacit consent to his dealing with Beresford, though he utterly destroyed this defence by his reckless and unfounded charges.

But Fitzwilliam was tried at the time when all was known and fresh in men's minds, and tried before a tribunal of men of honour acquainted with public life—by his own warm friends, who had introduced him into the Government, upheld him against Pitt, and threatened to resign when he suggested, before Fitzwilliam went to Ireland, that the appointment should be cancelled. These men—Portland, Spencer, Windham—after a little more than a month's actual experience of his style and conception of administration, came to the conclusion that he was *impossible*, and, so far from trying to defend him, they could stand him no longer. We have seen that his own close friend, Carlisle, was also forced to decide against him.

The results of the recall of Fitzwilliam were naturally unfortunate. He had excited hopes and expectations which, even if he had remained, he could not have satisfied, but which, going away as he did, people thought were defeated or interrupted by his recall. This led to widespread disappointment and much discontent. But it is unnecessary and unwise to attribute too much of the misfortunes of the next few years to this cause. Lord Rosebery<sup>1</sup> points out: ‘Because it was followed by some miserable years, it has been held to be the cause of the misery of those years. This is surely a

<sup>1</sup> *Pitt*, by Lord Rosebery, p. 182.

misstatement: it was rather a landmark. What in 1795 was called the Catholic question was rather a sign of grace than a measure of real importance. The mass of the Catholic peasantry already had the franchise under the Emancipation Act, 1792-93, and it import ed little to them whether or not a number of gentry of their own persuasion went up to Dublin to be bought and sold at the Castle; it had indeed always been a matter of indifference to them whether they were led by Protestants or Catholics.<sup>1</sup> Nor can parliamentary reform, if we may trust witnesses so intelligent and well-informed as McNevin, be said to have been an object of enthusiasm to the mass of the population. What pinched the people were tithes and excessive rents.' It must not be forgotten that even if Fitzwilliam had remained and passed through Parliament a Bill to permit Catholics to sit in Parliament, there was then the conscientious obstinacy of George III. to face. Assuming that the Irish Parliament passed the Bill, and it was then shipwrecked, would not the disappointment have been more acute and the outcry more bitter? The convictions of the King on this subject made a serious difficulty which Ministers had to consider. This led to Pitt's own resignation after the Union.

The real injury to the country was the excitement and disappointment and anger at the withdrawal and destruction of vague hopes—of some new and startling system—that would work miracles in the country.

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that in the year 1795 Maynooth was founded for the education of students intended for the Catholic priesthood. The Orange Society was also established in the same year.

The old order was to give way to some wondrous new one. The wild hopes excited by the French Revolution were in the air, and all this raised and sustained a dangerous state of excited feeling.

But the failure of Fitzwilliam cannot fairly be made answerable for more. When Fitzwilliam came, Ireland was in a serious state. The United Irishmen were thinking of dangerous projects. Tone had discussed projects of invasion, Jackson was awaiting trial for treasonable correspondence with France. No doubt the extreme party that was plotting treason and invasion availed themselves of the popular feeling excited by the recall of Fitzwilliam, and tried by that, as well as by every other means, to fan public discontent. Beresford,<sup>1</sup> writing to Auckland on September 4, 1796, says : ‘ Should things turn out ill here, Lord Fitzwilliam will not have any reason to exult. On the contrary, he is answerable for the whole mischief ; for, although the fire was in existence, though latent, it was he who blew it into a flame, and actually set the people into motion against the King and English Government. His prophecies are like those of the United Irishmen : he does the mischief first, and then prophesies that it will happen.’

But, assuming that Fitzwilliam had not been recalled, and the Ponsonbys had replaced the Beresfords, and the ‘clean sweep’ had been made, and he had been permitted to make efforts to pass his Catholic Emancipation Bill, and that the King had been persuaded to consent (a large assumption), is it likely that the men who had been plotting and planning treason after

<sup>1</sup> *Beresford Correspondence*, ii. 130.

treason, and invasion after invasion, would have been satisfied? The Relief Act of 1793 had not turned them for a second from their course. They were bold, resolute, determined men, and there was nothing in their past or future history to encourage the belief that they would have desisted.

The leading United Irishmen were then thinking of independence and separation. Wolfe Tone<sup>1</sup> (compromised by disclosures on Jackson's trial) had to fly, but before going he had sworn his friends to work for Irish independence.<sup>2</sup> It is worthy of note that Wolfe Tone in his autobiography (a most interesting book), never once even names Fitzwilliam. There is not a suggestion in it that Fitzwilliam's Viceroyalty or recall had even the smallest effect on the views of himself or his friends. The evidence<sup>3</sup> before the Secret Committee of

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to note an episode in his early life in which Lord Plunket and Archbishop Magee took part. They were students together in Trinity College, Dublin, and members of the famous College Historical Society, founded by Edmund Burke. Tone had won three medals in the society, and they were unfortunately stolen from him. The society resolved, on a motion proposed by Plunket and seconded by Magee, 'that Mr. Tone should be presented with three medals in the place of those which he had been robbed of, as well to testify our respect for so valuable a member as because we would wish to perpetuate the proofs of our own discernment' (*Irish Quarterly Review*, iv. 316).

<sup>2</sup> Before his judges he said: 'From my earliest youth I have regarded the connection between Ireland and Great Britain as the curse of the Irish nation, and felt convinced that whilst it lasted this country could never be free and happy' (*Autobiography of Wolfe Tone*, ii. 235, edited by Barry O'Brien).

<sup>3</sup> McNevin was asked: 'Would you think the mass of the people in the provinces of Leinster, Munster, and Connaught care the value of this pen, or the drop of ink which it contains, for Parliamentary reform or Catholic emancipation?' Answer: 'I am sure they do not, but they wish much to be relieved from tithes.' To T. A. Emmet: 'Would you think the mass of the people care for Catholic emancipation or Parlia-

1798 does not suggest that the recall of Fitzwilliam, or Catholic Emancipation, or Parliamentary reform, had any real effect on the nation, but goes to show that tithe relief was the only question that really stirred their minds.

McNally does not even hint that the Fitzwilliam episode tended to foment or cause disaffection.

On the occasion of Hoche's expedition to Bantry Bay, in 1796, the peasantry of Cork, Galway and Limerick, almost all Roman Catholics, vied with one another in proofs of loyalty to the English Government. This does not support the suggestion that Fitzwilliam's recall of the year before was regarded by the Roman Catholics of Ireland as a fatal step—a turning-point in their history. It very probably more seriously affected and disappointed some moderate prominent men than it did the mass of the people. The irreconcilables were quite unmoved by the episode.

Lord Edward Fitzgerald and O'Connor tried to negotiate a fresh invasion, and Hoche, with 15,000 men, essayed it in December 1796. Things became so

mentary reform ?' Answer : 'I believe the mass of the people do not care a feather for Catholic emancipation, neither did they care for Parliamentary reform till it was explained to them as leading to other objects which they looked to, principally the abolition of tithes' (*Proceedings of the Secret Committee*, August 1798). The Report of the House of Commons stated : 'The society under the name of United Irishmen was established in 1791; its founders held both what they termed Catholic emancipation and Parliamentary reform the ostensible objects of their union ; but it clearly appeared, from the letter of Theobald Wolfe Tone accompanying the original constitution, as transmitted to Belfast for adoption, that from its commencement the real purpose of those who were at the head of the institution was to separate Ireland from Great Britain, and to perfect the established constitutions of this kingdom.'

critical that the Government<sup>1</sup> had to pass an Insurrection Act to try to cope with the internal disorders of the country.

A Dutch invasion was planned and attempted in July 1797, and was only defeated by the naval victory of Admiral Duncan off Camperdown. The men who planned and plotted these invasions meant separation, and some died in the cause. Were these desperate efforts caused by Fitzwilliam's failure? If he had not been recalled would they have desisted? Until the end of time opinions may differ on this subject of the hypothetical results of the Fitzwilliam failure. But the failure itself cannot with any show of reason or fairness be ascribed to Pitt.

Matters became very bad in 1797: there were outrages of all kinds, and robbery of arms in all directions. The state of Ulster became very serious. Large parts of the North were placed under martial law, and had a commanding military force, largely composed of yeomanry and militia, quartered in them.

The people there were disarmed, and there were painful outrages on both sides, flogging and half-hanging, carding and houghing. The Rebellion was brewing. There was a state of 'smothered war.'

The Government had information enough, and jails were filling rapidly. In the early months of 1798 it was manifest that matters were coming to a crisis. On March 17, Oliver Bond and the Delegates were arrested.

<sup>1</sup> In England the Government had also to contend by strong measures with the dangerous spirit caused by the French Revolution. In 1793 the Traitorous Correspondence Act was passed, and in 1795 the Treasonable Practices and Seditious Meetings Acts were carried.

On May 19 the unfortunate Lord Edward Fitzgerald was captured. The two Sheares brothers were seized on the 21st. The Rebellion was fixed for all Ireland on May 23 ; but it hung fire. There was no rising except in Dublin, Kildare, and Meath, and, on its own account, in Wexford. Fortunately, it only lasted a few weeks. Mercifully it was confined to but a small part of the country, and the foreign allies of the rebels did not arrive in time. But it lasted long enough for the loss of many human lives, and to show the conflicts, outrages and catastrophes of a civil war—long enough to mark a sad and painful page in the history of Ireland.

Shortly after Bond's trial in July 1798, a compromise was made, by which the Government agreed to banish the rest of the prisoners upon getting *general* information as to the United Irishmen.

Later in the same year a pardon was passed, which applied to the humbler classes engaged in the Rebellion.

It is no part of the purpose of this chapter to sketch the painful scenes of the Rebellion. A new Viceroy came at its close—a man with a good and honest heart, an honourable nature, and a sound understanding.

He came in time to show a merciful spirit to the dying revolt. But the great work of the Viceroyalty of Cornwallis was the Union.

## CHAPTER VII

## PITT'S ONE LOVE STORY

Pitt wholly given to public life—There cold and distant—Quite different in private—Gay and witty—Opinions of Wellesley, Addington, and Rose as to attractiveness—One pun—Warmth of family affections—Kind to dependents—Purity of his life—Macaulay—Peter Pindar—Visit to France—Mdlle. Necker—Her mother appears to have thought of Pitt as suitor—Her daughter did not—Nor probably Pitt—Wilberforce heard rumour—Pitt never thought seriously of marriage until 1796—Hon. Eleanor Eden—Pitt's intimacy with her father—Knew her from childhood—Visits to Eden Farm—His picture—Hers—Much to attract him—And her—He had no confidant—Rumours—Burke's witty allusion—Discretion of Beresford—Pitt spent Christmas recess, 1796, at Eden Farm—Much attracted—But made up his mind not to proceed—Long letter to Auckland announcing decision—Reply not forthcoming—Further long letter from Pitt—Sad and decisive—Auckland's reply—Arranged what friends should be told—Draft of Pitt's letters—Pitt's action abrupt—Not known if they ever met after—Lady Hester's opinions of effect on Pitt—Two years later Eleanor Eden engaged to Lord Hobart—Addington tells Pitt—Who writes to Auckland 'with cordial good wishes'—Auckland differed from Pitt on Catholic questions—Criticises conduct in House of Lords—Left out of second Administration—Pitt took care no loss—Grateful letter of Auckland.

PITT was never married, but he had one love story, very interesting from the character of the man, from its curious history, and from its quite isolated and exceptional position in his life.

He had given himself up wholly to public life and its absorbing demands, and there he was cold, distant, haughty, proud. But in private life he was quite a different man. He enjoyed the society and companionship



Walker & Boutell, pho

*The Hon. Eleanor Eden.*



of the small circle of his intimate associates. He shone in conversation, and was one of the most agreeable at their meetings. He would then entirely unbend and lay aside all the austerity and severity of his demeanour and manner. No one could be gayer or wittier or more playful on those occasions. He won the love, admiration and constancy of his friends. He was a most fascinating companion, made to be loved.<sup>1</sup> He plunged heedlessly into the mirth of the hour, with no other care than to promote the general good humour and happiness of the company.<sup>2</sup> He was the life and soul of his own society. His appearance dispelled all care. His brow was never clouded, and joy and hope and confidence beamed from his countenance.<sup>3</sup> The Bishop of Lincoln has even preserved a pun which he once made.<sup>4</sup> His lifelong friend Wilberforce says that he was the wittiest man he ever knew. He was devoted to his family, and wrote frequently to his mother, showing the keenest interest in all her domestic affairs, and extending to her a large measure of his confidence. He was the best of brothers and of uncles, ever kind to inferiors and dependents, a warm friend and full of feeling for those in distress ; he must have had a good heart and a fund of sympathy in his nature which enabled him to win the devotion of those who knew him best. There never was a whisper against the

<sup>1</sup> Sidmouth's *Life*, i. 151.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Wellesley.

<sup>3</sup> *Diaries and Correspondence* of Right Hon. G. Rose, ii. 293.

<sup>4</sup> *Prettyman MSS.* ‘Lord Onslow told me, December 6, 1821, a pun of Mr. Pitt’s. At the time when the City Volunteer companies were formed, Mr. Pitt was told one day at table that the Custom House officers had embodied themselves. Mr. Pitt replied, “I am very glad of that ; they are all Cæsars (seizers) to a man !”’

correctness of his life. ‘From the passion which generally exercises the most tyrannical dominion over the young, he possessed an immunity which is probably to be ascribed partly to his temperament and partly to his situation. His constitution was feeble ; he was very shy ; and he was very busy. The strictness of his morals furnished such buffoons as Peter Pindar and Captain Morris with an inexhaustible theme for merriment of no very delicate kind.’<sup>1</sup>

During his visit to France, in 1783, there appears to have been some kind of a rumour about a possible marriage between him and Mademoiselle Necker. They met at Fontainebleau, but how often, or how far their acquaintance tended towards intimacy, it is now hard to say.

Whether Pitt ever really thought of it, we can only guess. There were many worldly reasons to make such a union appear suitable to his friends. She was wealthy, clever, young, attractive and Protestant, the daughter of a great French statesman. The idea must have reached some development, for amongst the papers of Madame Necker was found a letter<sup>2</sup> to her daughter, written probably at the end of 1783, intended to be given to her after her death.

‘Je désirais que tu épousasses Mr. Pitt. J’aurais voulu te mettre dans le sein d’un époux d’un grand caractère ; je voulais aussi avoir un gendre à qui je pusse confier le soin de ton pauvre père, et qui sentît le prix de ce dépôt. Tu n’as pas voulu me donner cette satisfaction. Eh bien, tout est pardonné si tu rends à ton père et à toi-même tout ce que j’attendais de cette union.

<sup>1</sup> Macaulay, *Essay on W. Pitt*.

<sup>2</sup> *Le Salon de Madame Necker*, par le Vicomte de Haussonville, ii. 56.

'Multiplies-toi pour produire des distractions que l'Angleterre, l'état d'un gendre et les affaires auraient pu donner à ton père.'

The daughter, however, appears to have been quite of a different way of thinking :<sup>1</sup>

'Pourquoi faut-il que cette malheureuse Angleterre ait développé contre moi la roideur et la froideur de Maman? Ille maudite, source présente de mes craintes, source à venir de mes remords, pourquoi faut-il que toutes ces offres brillantes soient venues m'ôter le droit de me plaindre de mon sort, et le rendre cependant plus malheureux? Faut-il qu'elles soient venues m'obliger à choisir, à vouloir ce que j'aurais tant aimé qu'on me forcât de faire, et me plonger dans une incertitude si terrible qu'il n'y a pas un argument qui ne soit combattu par l'autre?

'Je n'ai pas varié antérieurement, parce qu'un mouvement du cœur m'entraîne, mais seule, agitée, effrayée—Ah! c'en est fait, je ne puis aller en Angleterre.'

The idea would not appear to have much attracted the attention of Pitt's companions during his French visit, for Wilberforce,<sup>2</sup> in his 'Sketch of Pitt,' written in 1821, referring to this time, only cursorily refers to the subject: 'At Paris, in October 1783, or immediately afterwards, it was suggested to the late Lord Camden by Mr. Walpole, a particular friend of M. Necker, that if Mr. Pitt should be disposed to offer his hand to Mademoiselle Necker, afterwards Madame de Staël, such was the respect entertained for him by Monsieur and Madame Necker that he had no doubt the proposal would be accepted.'<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Le Salon de Madame Necker*, par le Vicomte de Haussouville, ii. 60. Extract of Journal of Mademoiselle Necker.

<sup>2</sup> *Private Papers of William Wilberforce*. Fisher Unwin, 1897.

<sup>3</sup> In the *Life of Wilberforce*, i. 39, the episode is stated thus: 'It

It is obvious that Wilberforce was not in the confidence of the young lady, and probably Pitt kept his own thoughts on the subject to himself. The incident, whatever were its exact dimensions, made no impression on him, and did not seriously enter into his life.

In one of his letters to Wilberforce, Pitt wrote : ‘The better part of love, as well as of valour, is discretion ;’ and he may have shown his discretion by doing nothing.

Pitt appears never to have really thought of marriage until some time in 1796, when he was in his thirty-eighth year, and when he had been constantly meeting Eleanor Eden at her father’s house, Eden Farm, which was in the neighbourhood of Holwood. He was a frequent visitor, and had probably known her from her childhood. She was the eldest daughter of Lord Auckland, a constant correspondent of Pitt on a great variety of public subjects, who had employed him in Paris, and raised him first to the Irish, and then to the English peerage.

Pitt had got into a habit of spending many of his short and hard-earned holidays there, finding it no doubt much more cheerful and bright than his own Holwood, where he lived quite alone.

She was a handsome and winning girl, full of life and intelligence and sympathy, just twenty—over eight-

was hinted to Pitt, through the intervention of Horace Walpole, that he would be an acceptable suitor for the daughter of the celebrated Necker.’ Necker is said to have offered to endow his daughter with a fortune of 14,000*l.* per annum, but Mr. Pitt replied, ‘I am already married to my country.’ It is most improbable that Pitt ever uttered melodramatic words of this kind, and the passage reads like mere gossip.

teen years younger than Pitt. There was everything to attract him to her, and to make him look forward to his visits to Eden Farm as a delightful contrast to the rest of his hard-worked and anxious life. There was much also to attract Eleanor Eden to Pitt. His portraits all tend to show that as a young man he had a distinguished appearance and striking and impressive face. At thirty-eight he was still comparatively young, and had all the charms of voice and manner, and fame. She must have known him all through her life. She never heard his name spoken of save with reverence, respect and admiration ; and when he singled her out for his special notice, and in his visits to Eden Farm walked and talked with her, one can well understand how pleased and flattered she must have been. And when he spoke to her with that exquisitely modulated silver voice, which had commanded the House of Commons and swayed it from his early manhood, which had dealt with great topics on great occasions, and when she realised that that voice was now being used to please her, she must have been moved. His whole career, too, was so striking, so dramatic ; he had fought such great fights against such great men—his courage was so splendid ; and then he was so delicate, his life was so lonely. Was there not much to win the sympathy and the regard of a generous girl ? Was there not much to help to win her love ?

He had no confidant : there was much solitariness in his life. The story of this one episode in his career can be told but imperfectly. It is not known exactly how and when it began. One of the earliest references to it

is in a letter<sup>1</sup> dated December 6, 1796, to Lord Auckland : ‘The question I ask Lady Auckland I want soon answered, for I have letter after letter to say how pleased everybody is with the intended marriage of our Minister to your *chère fille*.’

Edmund Burke<sup>2</sup> also, writing to Mrs. Crewe the same month, makes a humorous allusion to the rumour : ‘The talk of the town is of a marriage between a daughter of Lord Auckland and Mr. Pitt, and that our statesman, our *premier des hommes*, will take his Eve from the Garden of Eden.’

No doubt rumours were circulating, and the parents were anxious at their increase and persistency. There had never before been in England an unmarried Prime Minister of thirty-eight, apparently paying attention to a handsome girl, and there never was a more *bona fide* occasion for rumours. Lord Auckland thought it prudent to write to his intimate friend, John Beresford :

<sup>3</sup> *Eden Farm* : Dec. 22, 1796.

My dear Beresford,—We are all well here, and I will take the occasion to add a few words of a private and confidential kind. You may probably have seen or heard by letters or report of an intended marriage between Mr. Pitt and my eldest daughter. You know me too well to suppose that, if it were so, I should have remained silent. The truth is, she is handsome and possessed of sense far superior to the ordinary proportion of the world. They see much of each other, they

<sup>1</sup> *Auckland Correspondence*.

<sup>2</sup> *Correspondence of Edmund Burke*, iv. 417. Mrs. Crewe, afterwards Lady Crewe, like the celebrated Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire presided over a great political salon. She was a beautiful woman, whose likeness was painted by Sir Joshua Reynolds. Madame D'Arblay said of her ‘she uglifies everything near her.’

<sup>3</sup> *Auckland Correspondence*, iii. 369.

converse much together, and I really believe they have sentiments of mutual esteem ; but I have no reason to think that it goes further on the part of either ; nor do I suppose it is likely ever to go further.

Let me hear from you, and

Believe me, ever affectionately yours,

AUCKLAND.

Beresford, with infinite discretion, replied :<sup>1</sup>

Dec. 27, 1796.

I certainly heard of the report which you mention, and saw it in the newspapers. Lord Camden has more than once asked me if I knew anything about it. I answered, as I shall continue to do, that I knew nothing about it.

Pitt had intended to spend Christmas at Eden Farm, but was prevented by public business. He, however, spent a good part of the Christmas recess there, and then he and Eleanor Eden must have begun to realise what their feelings towards each other were, or might become.

This episode in Pitt's life is shortly referred to in the 'Auckland Correspondence' and in Stanhope's 'Life of Pitt,' but in a very meagre and incomplete way.

In the former it was darkly said that there were several 'painful' letters, while Lord Stanhope refers generally to the contents of the letters, the purport of which he would appear to have known, but he thought the correspondence was in the hands of the Auckland family.

Pitt plainly, when he left Eden Farm in January 1797, reluctantly and painfully made up his mind that there should be no proposal and no marriage. He

<sup>1</sup> *Beresford Correspondence*, ii. 143.

wrote two long letters to Lord Auckland on the subject, and those letters were returned by Lord Auckland to Pitt.

A letter of Lord Auckland's is missing, but the whole correspondence is comprised in these two stately letters from Pitt to Lord Auckland, the draft of these letters in Pitt's own writing, and a final long letter from Lord Auckland.

Bishop Tomline contemplated, as appears from his preface, a further volume, 'for which,' he says, 'I reserve what relates to Mr. Pitt's private life.' He never wrote that volume, but he plainly put away this correspondence for subsequent use, and this may account for Lord Stanhope not finding it. It is all now in the Pretyman<sup>1</sup> collection of Pitt's papers at Orwell Park, and, while it will be read with deep interest, its publication will dispel the impression that there was anything 'painful' or needing any mystery or concealment in what passed. There was nothing unworthy, although much to cause disappointment, in the incident.

The following letter<sup>2</sup> came as a complete surprise to Lord Auckland. It is certainly a very remarkable document, written obviously after much anxious thought, and with much painful deliberation, but without a particle of hesitation in its purpose. The draft shows the strong wish to leave no doubt, and to convey that, having made up his mind, he would not falter :

<sup>1</sup> It is now in the possession of Mr. Ernest Pretyman, M.P., the owner of Orwell Park, Ipswich, who is the great grandson of the Bishop.

<sup>2</sup> *Pretyman MSS.*

[*Most Private*]

Downing Street:<sup>1</sup> January 20, 1797.

My dear Lord,—Altho' the anxious expectation of public business would at all events have made it difficult for me to leave town during the last ten days, you may perhaps have begun to think that it cannot have been the only reason which has kept me so long from Beckenham. The truth is, that I have felt it impossible to allow myself to yield to the temptation of returning thither without having (as far as might depend upon me) formed a decision on a point which I am sensible has remained in suspension too long already. Having at length done so, I should feel myself inexcusable if (painful as the task is) any consideration prevented me from opening myself to you without reserve. It can hardly, I think, be necessary to say that the time I have passed among your family has led to my forming sentiments of very real attachment towards them all, and of much more than attachment towards one whom I need not name. Nor should I do justice to my own feelings, or explain myself as frankly as I think I ought to do, if I did not own that every hour of my acquaintance with the person to whom you will easily conceive I refer has served to augment and confirm that impression; in short, has convinced me that whoever may have the good fortune ever to be united to her is destined to more than his share of human happiness.

Whether, at any rate, I could have had any ground to hope that such might have been my lot, I am in no degree entitled to guess. I have to reproach myself for ever having indulged the idea on my own part as far as I have done without asking myself carefully and early enough what were the difficulties in the way of its being realised. I have suffered myself to overlook them too long, but having now at length reflected as fully and as calmly as I am able on every circumstance that ought to come under my consideration (at least as much for her sake as for my own), I am compelled to say that I find the obstacles to it decisive and insurmountable. In thus conveying to you, my dear Lord, what has been passing in my mind, and its

<sup>1</sup> The drafts of these two letters are preserved, and show numerous changes and amendments.

painful and unavoidable result, I have felt it impossible to say less.<sup>1</sup> And yet it would be almost a consolation to me to know that even what I have said is superfluous, and that the idea I have entertained has been confined solely to myself. If this should be the case, I am sure this communication will be buried in silence and oblivion. On any other supposition I know that I but consult the feelings of those who must be most in my thoughts by confiding it to your discretion. And in doing so I have every reason to rely on your prudence, kindness, and on those sentiments of mutual friendship which I hope will not be affected by any change which may at the present moment be unavoidable in what has lately been the habits of our intercourse. For myself, allow me only to add that, separated as I must be for a time from those among whom I have passed many of my happiest moments, the recollection of that period will be long present to my mind. The greatest pleasure and best consolation I can receive will be if I am enabled to prove how deep an interest I must always take in whatever may concern them.

They will not, I am sure, be less dear to me thro' life than they would have had a right to expect from the nearest and closest connection.

Believe me, my dear Lord, under all circumstances,  
Ever sincerely and faithfully yours,

W. Pitt.

The reply of Lord Auckland is not forthcoming, but it must be assumed from the next letter of Pitt that it fairly, and in no unworthy language, pointed out that it might be well to consider and wait before arriving at a final decision.

Pitt's second letter <sup>2</sup> was, if possible, sadder, stronger and more decisive than the first.

<sup>1</sup> This sentence was not in the draft, which contained instead the words, 'It is my first duty, under the circumstances, to state to you thus plainly the result. To enter into details would at all events be useless.'

<sup>2</sup> *Pretyman MSS.*

[*Most Private*]

Downing Street: January 22nd, 1797, 2 p.m.

My dear Lord,—If I felt much more than I could express in writing to you yesterday you will guess that these feelings are all, if possible, heightened by the nature of your answer. I will not attempt to describe the sense I have of your kindness and Lady Auckland's, much less how much my mind is affected by what you tell me of the sentiments of another person, unhappily too nearly interested in the subject in question. I can only say, but it is saying everything, that that consideration now adds to my unavailing regret as much as under different circumstances it might have contributed to the glory and happiness of life.

Indeed, my dear Lord, I did not bring myself to the step I have taken without having, as far as I am able, again and again considered every point which must finally govern my conduct. I should deceive you and everyone concerned, as well as myself, if I flattered myself with the hope that such an interval as you suggest would remove the obstacles I have felt, or vary the ground of my opinion.

It is impossible for me, and would be useless, to state them at large. The circumstances of every man's private and personal situation can often on various accounts be fully known and fairly judged of by no one but himself, even where, as in the present case, others may be equally interested in the result. On the present occasion I have had too many temptations in the opposite scales to distrust my own decision. I certainly had to contend with sentiments in my own mind such as must naturally be produced by a near observation of the qualities and endowments you have described, with those of affectionate attachment, of real admiration, and of cordial esteem and confidence.

If anything collateral could add strength to those sentiments, they would have derived it (as you know from what I have said already) from every circumstance, with respect to all parts of your family, which could tend to render such a connection dear and valuable to my mind. Believe me, I have not lightly or easily sacrificed my best hopes and earnest wishes to

my conviction and judgment. Believe me, also, further explanation or discussion can answer no good purpose. And let me entreat you to spare me and yourself the pain of urging it further. It could only lead to prolonged suspense and increased anxiety, without the possibility of producing any ultimate advantage.

Feeling this impression thus strongly and unalterably in my mind, I have felt it a trying but indispensable duty, for the sake of all who are concerned, to state it (whatever it may cost me to do so) as distinctly and explicitly as I have done. Having done so, I have only to hope that reading this letter will nowhere be attended with half the pain I have felt in writing it.

I remain, my dear Lord,

Ever sincerely and affectionately yours,

W. Pitt.

In addition to the foregoing two letters, Pitt would appear to have written a separate letter about office and public affairs, for Lord Auckland, in his reply of January 23, 1797, deals with both subjects. He plainly had a great regard for Pitt, and a great affection for and high opinion of his daughter, but now very naturally regretted the rumours which had connected their names together, and felt the necessity of giving some explanation to friends who might make inquiries. After acknowledging the receipt of the letters, he proceeds :

Your idea of the language to be held is consonant to what Lady Auckland carefully observed *previous* to the Christmas recess, not only to friends, but to the person most interested ; till, having misconceived the matter, she no longer thought it right to discourage the other from looking seriously to the result. Neither the impression made nor the sentiments formed would have been what they unhappily are if nothing had taken place after the Christmas recess.

I doubt whether you are in any degree aware how much the business has been observed and discussed in societies, correspondence and newspapers. If I alone were personally affected by such observations and discussions, my sex and time of life might authorise me to think them little pertinent, and to leave them to their course. That, however, is far from being the case; nor is it possible for me, consistently with what is too well known (when I must say anything), to confine myself to the sort of language suggested. You know how much it has been the habit of this family, in the undisguised cheerfulness which did exist in it, to receive all comers in the neighbourhood and others. You know also how regular our system of life is. Yesterday the two of the same name<sup>1</sup> were utterly unable to quit their apartments, or to see friends who, being accustomed to see them at church, called afterwards to enquire about them. The younger of the two still shows too much by her looks what has passed in her mind to be able to appear to-day; and there are several persons towards whom, notwithstanding the natural strength of her understanding, her feelings might betray themselves at a first meeting.

Under these circumstances, the language which we purpose to hold to the very few to whom we can bring ourselves to say anything will be to the following effect—‘That we are much obliged to them for the kindness they had expressed on a certain subject, respecting which we had hitherto preserved silence—that we, who know so well the excellent and resembling qualities of both parties concerned, must know that a constant intercourse would not fail to excite sentiments of mutual esteem and admiration, and probably even of affection; but that these sentiments, whether they have existed or not, certainly will never go further: that, being sorry to be convinced of this, we should feel it painful to say more, and we only wish the report to be discouraged, with all the delicate attention due to all concerned.’ I have actually written nearly in the above words to the Archbishop, to Mr. Halsett, and to one of my brothers; Lady A<sup>d</sup> has done the same to Lady Catherine Douglas. I must also write to Mr. Beresford, and a little more particularly to Morton

<sup>1</sup> Lady Auckland and her eldest daughter were both called Eleanor.

Eden, and possibly there are at most two or three others (such as the Duke of Marl<sup>h</sup>) to whom it may be necessary for us to write. As to all conversations on the subject, I am not likely to be exposed to them, and at any rate shall decline them.

Then, after some reference to the official letter, he goes on :

It is most important for all our sakes to show to the public, what I am sure will be true in fact, tho' subject to severe difficulties in practice, that there remains an undiminished friendship between us two at least ; and that a pleasant intercourse may in time be revived between our families, tho' suspended for the moment certainly with great abruptness.

And the letter closes with :—

Believe me, my dr<sup>r</sup> sir,

Ever sincerely and affect<sup>ly</sup> yours,

A<sup>d</sup>

Certainly Pitt's action had been abrupt. If he had allowed his feelings full play, and continued his courtship, he might have won a fair and honoured wife, who would have worthily shared his honours and divided his cares.

It is not recorded whether Pitt ever again met or spoke to Eleanor Eden. He had no confidant. He never wrote or spoke on the subject,<sup>1</sup> and, as far as is known, neither did she.

<sup>1</sup> 'Lady Hester said this nearly broke Pitt's heart, but Lady Hester's statements do not impress me with conviction' (Rosebery's *Pitt*, p. 265). It is most improbable that Pitt spoke much, if at all, to Lady Hester Stanhope on the subject. She was not living with him until some years after. She remained at Chevening until 1800, when she went to reside at Burton Pynsent with her grandmother, Lady Chatham. This brought her more into communication with him, and in a letter of April 19, 1801, she says: 'Oh, delightful! charming! This evening's post has not only brought me your letter, but a volume from Mr. Pitt. . . . He appears to be so

Her father wrote<sup>1</sup> to Mr. Hugh Elliott two years later, announcing her engagement to Lord Hobart:

Palace Yard : April 30, 1799.

My dear Elliott,—Your excellent sister has written a letter to me, and I have contrived to mislay it, and she is not present to write another. The chief purport of it was that Lord Hobart is to marry our eldest daughter, who is a very beautiful and good creature, with every advantage of a strong mind and right principles. This event has overjoyed us, for there never was a marriage which promised so much happiness.

Ever affectionately yours,

AUCKLAND.

happy and well, for he says that what with the luxury of living with his friends, and the improvement in public affairs, his only apprehension will be that of growing too fat for horseman's weight, at least as a companion in my rides. I certainly shall do much wiser to keep to my intention of seeing a good deal of him this summer, than allow myself to be hitched into the dissipation of a camp, instead of enjoying his society, from which I shall derive much more rational pleasure and more profit. How instinct taught me to love this "Great Man" ! and if I had not kept sight of him at a *distance*, what would have become of us all ? He means to come here in the summer.' The Duchess of Cleveland, in her *Life of Lady Hester*, also says: 'Her kind grandmother had died in April 1803, and Burton Pynsent had passed to her elder uncle, Lord Chatham, who had taken charge of his other niece, the orphaned Harriot Eliot. All her hope, therefore, was in Mr. Pitt. My father once told me that some time before, when talking of his sister to Mr. Pitt, he had asked him, "What is to become of Hester when Lady Chatham dies ? " and after a pause Mr. Pitt replied, "Under no circumstances could I offer her a home in my own house." The plan thus suggested was distinctly distasteful to him. It implied the breaking up of all his habits, and a total change in his mode of life, with the disturbing presence of a vivacious and impetuous niece, of whom till then he had seen very little. Yet when the emergency arose, he never for a moment hesitated. . . . His door was at once opened to her, and he welcomed her to his house as her permanent abode.' It is therefore manifest that, at the time of his romance, Pitt was not very intimate with Lady Hester ; and there is nothing in his correspondence to show that he ever referred to the subject to anyone. Any speculations of Lady Hester on the subject must therefore be received with some caution.

<sup>1</sup> *Auckland Correspondence*, iv. 96.

Pitt was made acquainted by Lord Auckland, through Mr. Addington, with the intended marriage, and his letter<sup>1</sup> of congratulation was perfectly calm and unemotional :

[*Private*]

Downing St.: Tuesday night.

My dear Lord,—I have heard from the Speaker the circumstance which you desired him to mention, and give you many thanks for your very kind attention in making the communication and in making him the channel of it. There could be no event interesting to any part of your family which would not be so to me, and certainly this is not the instance where I feel that sentiment the least.

I congratulate you and all around you with the most cordial good wishes.

Ever affectionately yours,

W. Pitt.

Eleanor Eden became, on the succession of her husband, Countess of Buckinghamshire, and died in 1851 without issue.

This is the one<sup>2</sup> romantic episode of Pitt's life. He did not explicitly give his reasons for his conduct : probably considerations of health as well as of fortune had weight with him.

Lord Auckland did not concur with Pitt on the Catholic question, and criticised his resignation in 1801.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Auckland Correspondence*, iv. 96.

<sup>2</sup> 'Lord Holland, an indifferent authority on this subject, says that Pitt paid attention to Miss Duncan, who was afterwards Lady Dalrymple Hamilton. But there seems no further confirmation of this statement' (*Pitt*, by Lord Rosebery).

<sup>3</sup> In the House of Lords he said that there was something behind he could not understand, that there must be some mysterious motive, since without explanation 'the resignation looked like a general getting into a post-chaise and leaving his army in the middle of a battle.' The speech was talked of everywhere (*Malmesbury's Diary and Correspondence*, iv. 49).

Pitt was dissatisfied with the public action of Lord Auckland during Addington's Administration, and therefore felt bound to leave him out of his Government in 1804, but he took care that this should not entail any pecuniary loss on the latter. Lord Auckland was already, as appears from the following letter<sup>1</sup> from Pitt, not ungenerously treated :

Downing Street : Tuesday, May 18, 1790.

My dear Lord,—I am happy that I have it at length in my power to relieve you from the long suspense in which you have remained, and to mention to you a new alternative which is just become practicable, and which I hope will be satisfactory to you. By the death of Lord Hardwicke, a reversion of the Tellership of the Exchequer is open, and I have the King's permission to offer it to you, either for yourself or, what I imagine you will prefer, for either of your sons. Till this should come into possession, you will of course remain entitled under the former assurances (as far as they can operate) to the Contingent pension of £2,000 per annum to yourself in case of your ceasing to be employed, and I will take care to have the assurances renewed on the present occasion. On this ground I flatter myself the arrangement will ultimately prove at least as beneficial to your family as that which unforeseen difficulties have frustrated. . . .

Yours most sincerely,  
W. Pitt.

The further arrangement which Pitt made to safeguard the pecuniary position of Auckland on leaving him out of the Government in 1804 appears to have commanded the gratitude of the latter, for he wrote at once the following cordial letter:<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Auckland Papers*, British Museum Add. MSS. 29475, f. 31.

<sup>2</sup> Stanhope's *Life of Pitt*, iv. 231.

Eden Farm : Dec. 18, 1804.

My dear Sir,—Having learnt from the Treasury that the warrants which you had recommended in consequence of my quitting the Post Office are now in a state of completion, I should be dissatisfied with myself if I omitted to express a warm and grateful sense of your kindness and favour shown to me during a long course of years, and on many occasions, both public and domestic. That kindness is more especially felt in the present instance, as its effects may be eventually material to the person whose interests you know to be justly dear to me beyond all worldly considerations.

Permit me to add that whatever may have been the misconceptions or the causes of grievance, real or imaginary, on either part, I now consent, and think it right that, in the comparative infirmities of human nature, the whole should be charged to my side of the account. But let it be understood, on the other hand, that I have ever preserved the same affection towards you without interruption, and in all times and circumstances. Nor have I ever ceased to reflect, with a mixture of fair pride, pleasure and regret, that so many of the happiest days of my life have been passed in your conversation and society.

Ever affectionately and sincerely yours,

AUCKLAND.

It is pleasant to note from the whole tone of the letter that the incident of a few years before had left no painful or unpleasant impression.





H. D. Hamilton pinx.

Malott & Russell phot.

*Lord Clarend.*

## CHAPTER VIII

### LORD CLARE

Conspicuous figure in Irish public life—Froude's description—Birth—Education—Bar—Attorney-General—M.P.—Stern opposition to Volunteers' Reform Bill—Napper Tandy and Convention—Fitzgibbon's courage—Pitt's caution—Dublin High Sheriff—Attachment in King's Bench—Attacked in Parliament—Regency debates, 1789—Irish Parliament differed from English—Possible Constitutional complications—Fitzgibbon's boldness—the Prince 'a most determined Irishman'—Round Robin—Denounced by Fitzgibbon—Pitt writes to thank Fitzgibbon—This helps Fitzgibbon to Chancellorship—Rutland had been resolute for it—His widow now helps—Fitzgibbon makes curious speech about Catholic concessions in 1793—Letter to Pitt—Opposed Fitzwilliam—Letter to Westmoreland—Dislike to Curran—Courage and eloquence of Curran—Sir R. Abercromby—Clare against—Pitt's letter—Kindness to political opponents—Clare to Auckland on Union—His anti-Catholic feeling—Union did not add to fame or advantage—Irksome to him—Abbot's opinion of him—Pelham—Charles F. Sheridan—Pelham signs dissent from his own Cabinet—Vicissitudes of his estimation—and official positions—Abbot's circular to Irish departments—Clare's violent letters to Pelham—Estimation of Clare—His death—His fortune—His will—His widow asks for pension—Pelham dropped by Pitt in 1804—Pitt's gift of doing unpleasant things gracefully—Letter to Duke of York—Pelham offered stick of Yeomen of the Guard.

ONE of the most conspicuous figures in Irish public life from 1780 until his death in 1802 was John Fitzgibbon, subsequently Lord Fitzgibbon and Earl of Clare.

He was a man of great eloquence, power, and force of character. Froude describes him as 'a small, delicately made man, with a handsome oval face, a bold grey eye, and a manner so haughty that patriot

members complained of his intolerable insolence.' His figure was slender and not robust, but his whole life shows he was a man of unshrinking boldness and iron courage. He had many attractive gifts, and Sir Jonah Barrington, a most unfriendly critic, says that although he was 'authoritative and peremptory in his address, commanding all, and arrogant in his language,' yet 'in domestic life he had many meritorious and some amiable qualities: an indefatigable and active friend, and kind and affectionate master, an indulgent landlord, liberal, hospitable and munificent, he possessed the seed of qualities very superior to those which he cultivated.'

This remarkable man was born at Donnybrook, near Dublin, in 1748, the son of John Fitzgibbon, Q.C., of Mount Shannon, in the county Limerick. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, was the class-fellow of Grattan, and his constant rival and competitor for prizes.<sup>1</sup> He was called to the Bar on June 19, 1772, and went the Munster Circuit, where Curran and Yelverton were his contemporaries. He got on rapidly at the Bar, and in 1778 became Member for Dublin University,<sup>2</sup> and was soon a prominent figure in the Irish House of Commons. He was appointed Attorney-General in 1783, during the Viceroyalty of Lord Northington, and with the full approval of Grattan, who was then and for some time after on friendly terms with him.

In the same year he signalised himself by his stern opposition to Flood's Reform Bill, brought in at the

<sup>1</sup> He afterwards entered Christ Church, Oxford, where he graduated M.A. in 1770.

<sup>2</sup> In 1783 he became Member for Kilmallock.

bidding of the Volunteers. His standpoint was as resolute as his language: ‘I will oppose it, because it comes under the mandate of a turbulent military congress. . . . I do not consider life worth holding at the will of an armed demagogue.’ A man with his strength of character, nerve, and power of command, naturally wielded enormous influence. His biographer<sup>1</sup> records: ‘He was the pivot on which all the movements of the Castle turned, the centre from which all its schemes and designs radiated; his words were strong as written law with successive Administrations. . . . His will was the law of seven Governments; he ruled in every Department with unbounded activity—in the Lords, the Privy Council and the Chancery Court.’

In the year 1784 he showed great personal and official courage in dealing with the summons to hold a National Convention or Congress. Napper Tandy had with great boldness directed the Sheriffs to summon meetings for the election of delegates for the Convention. The Irish Government regarded the matter with some anxiety, and it is fully discussed in their correspondence. Pitt<sup>2</sup> saw the danger of permitting the meeting, but, in giving his views to Orde, took care to draw the distinction clearly between Constitutional and unwarrantable meetings. Fitzgibbon deemed it necessary to take prompt and resolute action to stop the convention or make its holding worthless. Some of the Sheriffs had done nothing, and were hesitating as to their action, but Reilly, the High Sheriff of Dublin, had

<sup>1</sup> O’Flanagan’s *Lives of the Lord Chancellors of Ireland* i. 174, quoting from *The Notebook of an Irish Barrister*.

<sup>2</sup> *Bolton MSS.*, Pitt to Orde, September 25, 1784.

summoned the freeholders to meet to elect delegates. Fitzgibbon at once wrote to him : ‘ In summoning the freeholders and freemen of your bailiwick to meet for such a purpose, you have been guilty of a most outrageous breach of your duty ; if you proceed to hold it, you are responsible for it to the laws of your country, and I shall hold myself bound, as the King’s Attorney-General, to prosecute you in the Court of King’s Bench for your conduct, which I consider so highly criminal that I cannot overlook it.’ Reilly scoffed at the threat, called the meeting,<sup>1</sup> and was amusing the audience with reading Fitzgibbon’s letter, when the latter walked into the room, and then and there he repeated to those present that he would call the Sheriff to account if he proceeded with the business. Reilly was overawed, and the meeting dispersed. Think of a law-officer of to-day taking an active, personal, police part in asserting his view of the law ! Fitzgibbon would not let the matter rest, but moved in the Court of King’s Bench for an attachment against Reilly as an officer who had abused his commission. The judges upheld the views of Fitzgibbon, for which they were themselves attacked in the House of Commons<sup>2</sup> by Curran and others. Pitt thought the whole matter one of ‘ great delicacy and caution,’ but such were not Fitzgibbon’s methods when he had strong views. The Duke of Rutland thanked him for his ‘ manly and spirited conduct,’ and conveyed to him the King’s ‘ entire approbation of his conduct.’

<sup>1</sup> Froude, *English in Ireland*, book vii. p. 417.

<sup>2</sup> A motion of censure was moved by Lord Charles Fitzgerald, but was rejected by 143 to 71.

In the debates on the Regency Bill in 1789 Fitzgibbon behaved with his usual courage and consistency. There were many notable examples then in public life of men who felt an anxiety to stand well with the Prince, who might soon have such great power. As is well known, a large majority in the Irish Parliament supported Fox's view against Pitt's, and desired, regardless of what had been done in England, to recognise the Prince's inherent right to the Regency.

Pitt's resolutions were carried in the English House of Commons on January 16, 1789, and communicated in the following month to the Irish House of Commons, who promptly passed a resolution that an Address, entirely at variance with the English precedent, be presented to the Prince of Wales, requesting him to undertake the Government.

The seriousness of the attitude did not turn on the consideration of which Parliament was more Constitutionally accurate, but on the fact that in such a question as the Regency the Irish Parliament had asserted and exercised a right to take entirely independent action. Mr. Lecky considers that it was 'the greatest political error of Grattan's life.' Fitzgibbon nailed his colours to the mast, and spoke with unshrinking boldness against what were known to be the Prince's views, and denounced the proposal as 'contrary to common and statute law, and highly criminal, not only improper but treasonable.' He put it boldly: 'Gentlemen who profess themselves advocates for the independence of the Irish Crown are advocates for its separation from England.' The Prince showed his feelings by sending a message to

Grattan through Pelham : ‘Tell Grattan that I am a most determined Irishman.’

The Lord-Lieutenant would not forward the Address, and the King recovered, but the incident had probably a great effect on Fitzgibbon’s fortunes.

A rumour got about that all places and pensions held by Members of Parliament in opposition, at the pleasure of the Crown, were to be taken from them in consequence of voting the Regency Address, and this was at once resented in a Round Robin signed by fifty-six members, that if anyone was made ‘the victim of his vote’ they would not accept his office or pension. Fitzgibbon at once denounced this confederacy :<sup>1</sup> ‘I have heard that the spirit of Whiteboyism has found its way into this city, and that injurious and dishonest combinations have taken place. I do not now speak of the combinations of the journeymen pin-makers, who have suffered in Newgate for their offences : I speak of other combinations, which, had they been entered into against a tithe proctor, the combining parties, by laws of their own making, would be condemned to be whipped at a cart-tail.’ It is impossible to conceive language more strong and contemptuous.

Pitt was impressed by Fitzgibbon’s bold and loyal attitude on the Regency question, and wrote to him the following letter :<sup>2</sup>

Downing Street : Feb. 23, 1789.

Dear Sir,—I cannot help troubling you with these few lines to express the strong sense which I am sure every true friend to Great Britain and Ireland must entertain of obligation to you

<sup>1</sup> O’Flanagan’s *Lives of the Lord Chancellors of Ireland*, ii. 189.

<sup>2</sup> *Dublin University Magazine*, xxx. 682.

in the present critical conjuncture, for the stand you have made in support of these principles, on which the safety of all for centuries so essentially depends. Allow me to add how happy I feel personally at such a moment in being embarked in the same boat with you, and to assure you of in every circumstance a grateful recollection of the support and credit which the cause of our Government has received from your exertions.

I am, with great regards, dear sir,

Your obedient and faithful servant,

W. Pitt.

This good opinion of Pitt no doubt operated in favour of Fitzgibbon when the death of Lord Lifford, a few months later, left the Lord Chancellorship vacant. When, three years before, Lord Lifford was said to be dying, Orde had broached the topic to the Duke of Rutland as to a successor, and, not liking to lose Fitzgibbon's immense aid in the House of Commons, suggested that Baron Eyre, an English judge, might be temporarily appointed. But Rutland would not listen to anything of the kind, and replied<sup>1</sup> with decision: 'I shall not be satisfied to see Fitzgibbon's objects even postponed. I love the man. He has stood by me, I must stand by him. . . This opinion is final. As I before informed you, he is on the verge of matrimony.' Fitzgibbon was just going to be married to Miss Whaley, sister of the celebrated and eccentric Buck Whaley.

Some mention, however, of an English judge was again made, when Rutland wrote, if possible, more resolutely to Orde: 'I must stand my ground on the subject of the Irish Chancellorship. . . I cannot sacri-

<sup>1</sup> *Bolton MSS.*, Rutland to Orde, June 13, 1786. See also, under date of June 8, 1786, letter in *Hist. MSS. Com.*, 'Rutland Correspondence,' iii. 307.

fice Fitzgibbon. He deserves all I can give him, and I shall fling every obstacle in the way of any arrangement which is to preclude him.' Orde was plainly against the appointment, and said that Pitt was also. Beresford, himself an Irishman, and a personal friend of Fitzgibbon, was also opposed to it. The question, however, had to stand over, for Lord Lifford did not die until 1789, when Fitzgibbon's services and loyalty on the Regency question had to be placed to his credit, and, notwithstanding the opposition of Thurlow, he was appointed Lord Chancellor, being commonly<sup>1</sup> deemed the first Irishman appointed to that office. He had a staunch friend in the Duchess of Rutland, and was also supported by the Viceroy, Lord Buckingham.<sup>2</sup> He was at the same time created Baron Fitzgibbon, and had the honour of receiving an involved letter from Thurlow, who in complicated sentences cleverly mingled congratulations and apologies.

In 1793 the Address in reply to the Viceroy's speech, which was largely in favour of Catholic relief, was adopted, having been seconded by Arthur Wellesley (Wellington). It was followed by a wide measure,

<sup>1</sup> Of course, many of the Ecclesiastical Chancellors were Irishmen, and several of the lay Chancellors were Anglo-Irish. Brodrick and Cox, who were Chancellors in the early part of the eighteenth century, belonged to families settled in Ireland for two or three generations, and Jocelyn was also a member of the Irish Bar.

<sup>2</sup> This is stated strongly in O'Flanagan's *Lives of the Lord Chancellors of Ireland*, ii. 200; but at an earlier date Lord Buckingham held the opposite view, for in a letter to Pitt, written in November (1785 ?), he says: 'I know (and I beg to recommend it to your most serious attention) that you should run every risque rather than appoint an Irishman to that station.' He was then also dealing with the suggestion to appoint Fitzgibbon if Lord Lifford died at the time (*Prettyman MSS.*).

abolishing many disabilities and conferring the franchise on Catholics. On this occasion Fitzgibbon, then Lord Chancellor, made a curious speech for an official, strongly against the policy of concession. His views were always resolutely anti-Catholic, and on May 14 of that year he wrote<sup>1</sup> strongly to Pitt on the proceedings of the Catholic Convention :

Dublin: May 14, 1793.

Dear Sir,—I am confident that you will forgive me for troubling you upon a subject on which I had the honour of some communication with you when I was last at London.

Lord Westmoreland has, I presume, apprised you of the proceedings of the Catholic Convention at their last meeting, that they declared their intention to unite their efforts with the friends of Parliamentary reform, and voted to Mr. Butler the precise sum in which he had been fined for libelling the House of Lords. However strongly these circumstances mark their dispositions towards the Established Government, one other vote of money which they passed will, I hope, explain to you fully and unequivocably that I am not mistaken in the opinion which I submitted to you, that their ultimate object is to separate this country from Great Britain.

They have voted £1,500 to a Mr. Tone—who is their Cabinet Minister and adviser—who first proposed an alliance between the Puritans and Catholics, and whose great object will be explained to you by the paper which I have the honour to enclose to you much better than by any comment of mine upon the subject. This gentleman has been called to our Bar. He is the son of a Dublin tradesman, and has the merit of being the founder of the Society of United Irishmen. He was also the original projector of the Catholic Convention, drew up the circular letter issued in the course of the last summer in the name of Mr. Edward Byrne, and composes most of the seditious and treasonable libels which are put forth by the Society of United Irishmen.

The paper which I enclose to you is also one of his com-

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*

position. It was written early in the summer of 1791, and privately circulated by him amongst his confidential friends at Dublin and Belfast. The first part of it contains the first declaration of the Society of United Irishmen, and was printed and distributed by them on their first formation. The latter part, you will see, contains his private opinion of the means necessary to be pursued to carry the main object.

This gentleman at present is the confidential agent and adviser of the men who govern the whole body of the Roman Catholics. They have already paid him very large sums of money, and concluded their last sitting by voting him a further sum of £1,500. Mr. Tone is also a very great friend and intimate of a young gentleman whose name I mentioned to you very lately, and whose connections certainly ought to guard him against such a companion.

I have the honour to be, my dear sir, with great truth and respect, your faithful and most humble servant,

FITZGIBBON.

The Rt. Hon. W. Pitt.

Fitzwilliam did his best to get rid of Fitzgibbon, but Pitt and his other colleagues would not hear of it. As might be expected from his character and the circumstances of the position, Fitzgibbon was strongly against Fitzwilliam, as is stated in the chapter dealing with his unfortunate viceroyalty, and as appears very fully in the ‘Beresford Correspondence.’

The following letter<sup>1</sup> of Clare to Westmoreland, written on the day of Fitzwilliam’s departure, is characteristic and very—too outspoken :

[*Private*]

Dublin : March 25, 1795.

My dear Lord,—This day His Excellency Lord Fitzwilliam took his departure from Ireland, having left behind him the legacy which I now enclose to your Lordship. Immediately

<sup>1</sup> *Westmoreland Papers*, State Paper Office, Dublin Castle. See Lecky, vii. 95.

upon his intimation to me that he meant to retire from his government, he stated his opinion to be that he ought to embark privately. In this opinion I concurred entirely, and offered him my house at the Black Rock for any time that he might chuse to make use of it ; at that time I understood it was his intention to have accepted the offer. However, he was induced to alter his determination, and this day, after a crowded levee, he set off in procession from the Castle at one o'clock. Everything was perfectly quiet, not even a hiss from the mob in the streets addressed to any of the men who followed him. At the College a set of fellows who had been planted there took his horses from his coach, and drew him from there to the Pidgeon House, much to the annoyance of Lord Fitzwilliam, who, I was told, got into histericks. After he had got into the boat which conveyed him to the yacht, he waved his hat and bowed most graciously to the ponies who had given him a set-down to the Pidgeon House, and so the ceremony ended. He intended to have gone away on Monday, but the Commissions for giving the Royal assent to the Bill were so drawn that Lords Justices could not have acted on Monday. He sent to me to inform me of his intended departure on this day, when I stated to him that I did suppose of course he meant to send down a message on the next day to both Houses of Parliament to adjourn for a fortnight. This, however, he peremptorily refused ; and, after arguing with him for half-an-hour in vain, I stated my determination to him explicitly not to undertake the government of the country, if it were but for twenty-four hours, unless the Parliament was adjourned. This, however, had not apparently the desired effect, and I then requested of him to allow the Primate, the Speaker, and me to wait upon him the next day to remonstrate upon the subject, to which he consented. Before we had arrived at the Castle Pelham had landed, and had in vain pressed him to send down a messenger to adjourn, or even to direct Lord Milton to make a motion to adjourn, to the 13th of April, without the formality of a message. However, after some argument by the Speaker and me, he consented to send down the message, and both Houses now are adjourned to April 13. I must presume that your Lordship has heard the

history of his letters to Lord Carlisle, as I see they have been announced in the public prints. Within a few days he has had more than fifty manuscript copies made of them by the clerks in the different offices about the Castle, which have been distributed openly by his orders, and I presume will soon get into print. One copy I have been able to procure, which I enclose to your lordship. If I could have had it transcribed before the post went out, I meant to have sent a copy to Lord Auckland, but, as I wish to lose no time in sending it to you, will you have the goodness to get it transcribed for Lord Auckland, and to send it to him in my name? If anything were wanting to complete the catalogue of his indiscretions since his arrival in Ireland, this last act has certainly filled the measure of them. So much malignity and folly and falsehood, and such notorious violation of public trust and private faith, never have been exhibited by any man to whom the management of a great kingdom was committed, as the infatuated man has manifested in these letters to his friend, Lord Carlisle. In one of them your lordship will see he has published a very serious and important passage in a private and confidential dispatch, as he candidly states it to be, which he has received from the Duke of Portland—a passage intimating broadly his opinion that if the Catholic claims could be postponed for consideration till there should be a peace they might induce the Protestants of Ireland to consent to a union with the Parliament of England. I do most strongly suspect that this idea was drawn out from the Duke of Portland by Lord Fitzwilliam's representation of a conversation which I had with him upon the subject of his Popish projects, in which I stated to him distinctly my opinion that a union with the Parliament of England was the only measure which could give Great Britain a chance of preserving this country as a member of the empire. I told him, however, that till Great Britain was at peace, and we had a strong army in Ireland, it would be impossible to carry such a measure, however necessary it might be. He told me more than a month since that he had reported my opinion upon this subject to the British Parliament, and if I am founded in my conjecture that his report of my conversation with him to the Duke of Portland

drew from him the private and confidential intimation which Lord Fitzwilliam had thought thus fit to publish to the world it only aggravates the gross breach of publick trust and private faith of which he has in this instance been guilty. Throughout the whole of these letters there is the continued series of gross falsehood and misrepresentation—‘That the Catholic claims were forced upon him, and that they were pressed forward against his inclination.’ The truth is notorious that unless these claims had been solicited by his friends and Ministers Mr. O’Beirne and Mr. Grattan, they would have slept in quiet. This I stated to him explicitly, and he knows the fact to be so. Long before his appointment to the government of Ireland Doctor O’Beirne had publickly pledged him to the Papists of Ireland that, if they would come forward boldly to claim an unqualified repeal of all the laws which affected them, Lord Fitzwilliam would yield to their claims. Mr. Grattan, immediately on his return to Ireland, sent for Mr. Edw. Byrne and Mr. Keogh, and pledged Lord Fitzwilliam to them for the unqualified repeal of all the laws which affected them. Mr. Grattan directed them to join in petitions to Parliament and addresses to Lord Fitzwilliam from every part of the country, and pledged himself for the success of the measure. But with what point can Lord Fitzwilliam say that he wished to keep back their claims, when a little more than one week after his arrival here, before he could possibly have had time for inquiry or deliberation upon the subject, he made a speech to a mob of five hundred men who came up to the Castle with an address from the Papists of Dublin, in which he stated distinctly to them that all causes of discrimination between Protestant and Papist had ceased, and that they might claim everything as due to their cordial allegiance and approved loyalty?

His attacks upon Beresford are such that, if I were to advise him, he ought to bring an action against Lord Fitzwilliam for defamation. In such an action he may, if he can, prove the charges which he has advanced. The postscript which your lordship will see in my handwriting to one of the letters was sent last night to the copying clerks to be added to it. I am not certain whether it has been given to me in the words of it,

or that I have only the import of it sent to me. It seems to be the boldest experiment which has ever been made by the King's representative in Ireland on his departure from his government, and, whilst he continues in authority, publicly to recommend 'the good people' of this country to pursue a measure patronized by him, and for which he has been recalled by the unanimous opinion of the British Cabinet condemning that measure as ruinous to the Empire. Whether such a proceeding will be suffered to pass unnoticed and unreprehended, your Lordship knows better than I do.

Lest you should not take in the 'Hibernian Journal,' I send you one of this day, which contains two addresses to the Duke of Leinster and Mr. George Knox. The addresses show pretty clearly what we may expect from the gratitude and fine feelings of Irish Papists. Mr. Knox's answer seems somewhat extraordinary, coming from a Commissioner of the Revenue. I told Mr. Pitt two years since what this gentleman is. Rely upon it, he must be watched. He is as notorious a rebel and democrat in heart as Mr. Tone, who is his intimate friend and playfellow.

Yours always truly, my Lord,

FITZGIBBON.

Your Lordship will observe the use which Mr. Grattan has made of Lord Fitzwilliam's communication to him of the passage contained in the Duke of Portland's private dispatch. Mr. Grattan's answer to the address of the Papists of Dublin, in which he advises them not to postpone their claims to the time of peace, was given by him on the 27th or 28th of February. It is plain, therefore, that this communication was made to him at the instant it was received, and at the same instant was communicated by Mr. Grattan to his Popish allies.

Fitzgibbon had an acute dislike for Curran, which appears to have marked his whole life. They fought a duel in 1789, when, to use Lord Plunket's expression, 'unluckily they missed each other.' He should have put away all signs and tokens of this rancour when he

became Lord Chancellor, but he does not appear to have done so; and Curran, although he never abated his courage or faltered in his language,<sup>1</sup> said that Fitzgibbon's attitude so *told* on the number of his clients that he lost 30,000*l.* by it. Curran, in a well-known case before the Irish Privy Council, when the Chancellor was presiding, mercilessly lashed Fitzgibbon under pretence of describing Sir Constantine Phipps. In that age of orators Curran occupied a prominent place,<sup>2</sup> and he never hesitated to use his great powers in defending himself from Fitzgibbon, who was created Earl of Clare in 1795.

<sup>1</sup> It is related that one day, when pleading the cause of his client before the Chancellor, Curran happened frequently to make use of the words 'also' and 'likewise,' drawing a distinction between them. Lord Clare interrupted by saying, 'Mr. Curran, it appears to me that you draw a fanciful distinction between the words that to me always appeared synonymous?' 'No fanciful distinction, my lord,' replied Curran; 'the great and good Lord Lifford for many years presided over this Court, which he adorned; you *also* preside over it, but not likewise' (*The Lord Chancellors of Ireland*, p. 164, by Oliver Burke).

<sup>2</sup> His speech in defence of Hamilton Rowan, when prosecuted for seditious libel, is celebrated. Dealing with the point of the publication proposing emancipation to all religious creeds, he said: 'I speak in the spirit of the British law, which makes liberty commensurate with and inseparable from British soil; which proclaims even to the stranger and the sojourner the moment he sets his foot upon British earth that the ground upon which he treads is holy and consecrated by the genius of universal emancipation. No matter in what language his doom may have been pronounced, no matter what complexion incompatible with freedom an Indian or an African sun may have burnt upon him, no matter in what disastrous battle his liberty may have been cloven down, no matter with what solemnities he may have been devoted upon the altar of slavery, the first moment he touches the sacred soil of Britain the altar and the god sink together into the dust, his soul walks abroad in his own majesty, his body swells beyond the measure of his chains that burst from around him, and he stands redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled by the irresistible genius of *universal emancipation!*' (*Curran's Life*, i. 812, by his Son; *vide also Howells' State Trials for 1794*).

When Sir Ralph Abercromby came to Ireland as Commander of the Forces in 1798, he found many things to dissatisfy him as to the discipline and conduct of the troops placed under his charge, and being a distinguished and experienced soldier he expressed in strong language his views as to the necessity of change. Unfortunately, he expressed himself injudiciously and with imperfect information in his well-known General Order of February 26, 1798, and this caused a great outcry from the Irish officials, and was disapproved by the Viceroy and the Chancellor, although Pelham, the Chief Secretary, did what he could to do full justice to the honesty of Abercromby's motives.<sup>1</sup>

Clare was extremely outspoken, and Lord Camden, the Lord-Lieutenant, wrote to Pitt about 'the most injudicious and almost criminal order of Sir R. Abercromby.' On March 13 Pitt replied :<sup>2</sup>

The order, I fear, must produce great embarrassment both to you and to us. Even supposing the irregularities to have been ever so great, yet such a public, indiscriminate and unqualified censure on the whole army could hardly be necessary to correct them, and seems more likely either to break their spirits or to alienate their affections ; which of the two would be worst I know not. One sentence really describes them in a manner which almost amounts to an invitation to a foreign enemy. In addition to this, all the accounts which we receive of the state of the most disturbed parts of Ireland lead me strongly to doubt whether it can in many cases be practicable to act only under

<sup>1</sup> The General Order stated : 'The very disgraceful frequency of courts-martial, and the many complaints of irregularities in the conduct of the troops, have too unfortunately proved the army to be in a state of licentiousness which must render it formidable to everyone but the enemy.'

<sup>2</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*

orders of the Civil Magistrates, when so many magistrates are murdered for doing their duty, and juries as well as witnesses are deterred from doing theirs.

The Beresford correspondence shows the very unfavourable view that Clare and John Beresford took of Abercromby's proceedings. Clare was not a man who ever hesitated to express his opinions in the plainest language. He always called a spade a spade, and he thought that Sir R. Abercromby had entirely destroyed his usefulness by his hasty and injudicious language. The episode was unfortunate. Abercromby was a distinguished and honest man. It would have been well if some expedient had been found to adjust matters and retain his services ; and it would, of course, have been better if he had used more cautious language.

With his vigour of courage, of character, and of expression, it must also be borne in mind that Clare was a man of strong friendships and of warm domestic affections. He was capable of most generous and considerate kindness to political opponents—to Hamilton Rowan, to the two Sheares, to Lord Edward Fitzgerald. His biographer<sup>1</sup> narrates Clare's interview with the two Sheares before the insurrection of 1798, and quotes the words of his authority: 'The Chancellor's object was certainly benevolent and conciliatory, but they were intractable.' His kindness and humanity during the last hours of the unfortunate Lord Edward Fitzgerald and securing the visit of his aunt to his death-bed are recorded in a touching narrative quoted by Mr. Lecky.

<sup>1</sup> O'Flanagan's *Lives of the Lord Chancellors of Ireland*, i. 219. It appears that Dr. Madden did not concur as to Lord Clare's motives.

From an early period Clare looked to the Union as the real remedy for all the difficulties of Irish government. This appears very plainly from the following letter<sup>1</sup> to Lord Auckland :

Dublin : Friday.

My dear Lord,— . . . As to the subject of the Union with the British Parliament, I have long been of opinion that nothing short of it can save this country. I stated this opinion very strongly to Mr. Pitt in the year 1793, immediately after that fatal mistake into which he was betrayed by Mr. Burke and Mr. Dundas in receiving an appeal from the Irish Parliament by a Popish Democracy. I again stated the same opinion to him in the last winter ; and, if this were a time for it, I think I could make it clear and plain to every dispassionate man in the British Empire that it is utterly impossible to preserve this country to the British Crown if we are to depend upon the precarious bond of Union which now subsists between Great Britain and Ireland. It makes me almost mad when I look back at the madness, folly, and corruption, in both countries, which has brought us to the verge of destruction.

Yours always truly, my dear Lord,

CLARE.

His anti-Catholic feeling has been referred to. He exceeded in 1799 his action in 1793. He actually assisted, in the House of Lords, to throw out the Government Bill for the improvement of Maynooth College.

It is manifest, from the correspondence of the time, that Clare was left in ignorance of any intended concessions to the Catholics, and was not informed of any negotiations with their leaders. When, after the Union, he found it out, he denounced the way he had been kept in the dark and, as he said, been deceived. This infused

<sup>1</sup> *Auckland Papers*, British Museum, 29475, f. 44. From a reference in the letter to the battle of New Ross, it must have been written in 1798.

some bitterness and disappointment into the short remainder of his life.<sup>1</sup>

But into the great work of the Union he threw himself with all his power. He profoundly believed in its policy and success. He considered it as a necessity for the future of Ireland and an outcome of its history ; and this appears all through his great speech on the Union in the House of Lords quoted in another chapter. His clear, strong idea was that separation was the one object of Irish agitation, and that Catholic Emancipation and Reform were only mentioned to delude the better classes. He steadily protested<sup>2</sup> that Ireland of all the nations in Europe was the most dangerous to tamper with or make experiments upon. The one remedy he saw was the Union, and he held this view honestly, consistently, and with courage.<sup>3</sup>

The change effected by the Union did not add to his personal fame or power. He made no successful speech at Westminster. The new position was irksome and trying to a man of his imperious temper. It had diminished his influence and importance, and during the short time that he lived after the Union he experienced some of the worry and annoyance of a

<sup>1</sup> A letter of Clare to Castlereagh, October 16, 1798, goes to show that Clare did not know Pitt's views about the Catholics (*Castlereagh Correspondence*, i. 393 ; see also letters—Cooke to Castlereagh, February 4, 1801, and Cornwallis to Castlereagh, *ib.* iv.).

<sup>2</sup> *Irish Parliamentary Debates*, February 19, 1798.

<sup>3</sup> The suggestion that he ever changed his views as to the policy of the Union may be dismissed as quite unreliable. It would appear to be founded on the assertion of his nephew, Jeffreys—‘I afterwards saw Lord Clare die repenting of his conduct on that very question’—mentioned in Grattan's *Life* by his son (iii. 413). But Clare was not on terms with this nephew, and any such interview between them is most improbable.

transition period—before the new order was established and the precise relations between the central Government in London and the Vice-Regal Government in Dublin were determined. Abbott, the Chief Secretary after the Union, under Lord Hardwicke, says that Clare was discontented and disrespectful<sup>1</sup>—that he was ‘hostile to any government by Lord-Lieutenants, desiring himself to be Lord Deputy or at the head of the Lords Justices.’ But Clare and Abbott disliked one another, and their testimony about each other is to be received with caution. Clare was too masterful and used to command for Abbott, and the Chief Secretary was too prying and energetic about abuses and reforms to suit officials of the old *régime*.

Pelham is possibly answerable for some of the friction. He elected to go on with Addington when Pitt resigned, and was then appointed head of the Home Department, that directly connected with the Irish Government and the channel by which the Viceroy had to communicate officially with the Crown and the Imperial Government. It shows the high estimate in which Pelham was then held that he was at the same time given a peerage and the management of business in the House of Lords which had been in the hands of Lord Hobart. He was also married at this date, and all these combined events led to his getting a mass of letters of congratulations, and amongst the number the following very studied production from the brother of R. B. Sheridan:<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lord Colchester’s *Diary*, i. 287.

<sup>2</sup> *Pelham Papers*, British Museum, 33107, f. 333.

Waterford: August 24, 1801.

Persons circumstanced as I am, whose every once-indulged hope has vanished before repeated disappointments, to whom the future presents no cheering prospect, and whose present existence is marked by vexations and misfortunes, and the suffering of bodily complaints produced perhaps by the pressure of these misfortunes—such persons can experience few gratifications which have their source in themselves; but if their capacity for friendship and affection has not with every other means of comfort deserted them, they may still look to the enjoyment of those gratifications of the heart which have their source in the happiness of others.

Retired as I live in this corner of the world, almost entirely devoted to philosophical pursuits, so as scarcely to feel interested in any political events, two paragraphs in the public papers taught me that I could not view all political events with equal apathy, nor feel equally indifferent to all other events which take place out of the sphere of my retirement. By the first paragraph I was informed that Lord Pelham was appointed Secretary of State—by the second, that Lord Pelham was married. Allow me then, my Lord—and, were you not Secretary of State, I should venture to say my dear Lord—to indulge the sincere gratification I feel at two events so highly interesting to those who feel for your Lordship that esteem and that affection which I do, by congratulating you most cordially upon both. . . .

Your Lordship's very faithful, affectionate, and truly  
attached Servant,

CHA. FRA. SHERIDAN.

It is strange, according to present constitutional methods, to note that Pelham protested in writing<sup>1</sup> against the minute of Cabinet for signing the definitive Treaty of Amiens, March 14, 1802:

Dissentient because I think it necessary, for the security and interest of H. M. Dominions, that before any definitive

<sup>1</sup> *Pelham Papers*, British Museum, 38108, f. 154.

treaty is signed a satisfactory explanation should be required both as to the objects of the different expeditions which have been fitted out from France without previous communication with this country, and as to the general views of the French Republic. (Then follow detailed reasons.)

(Signed) PELHAM.

It would be impossible now to conceive a formal written protest by a Cabinet Minister against the decision of his colleagues. A Minister whose dissent required such a protest should resign.

Pelham tried to lay down narrow and circumscribed lines for the Viceroy and the Irish Privy Council. Lord Hardwicke vigorously asserted the rights of his position, and not unnaturally in these first months there must have been a good deal of bold assertion and resolute denial put forward on both sides before a new practice was established. All the time and experience after 1800 was galling and disappointing to Clare. He had not, as we have seen, been taken into confidence about the Catholic negotiations, and he found his importance dwarfed and his influence diminished under the new system which he had so striven to bring about. He was not on very intimate terms with Lord Hardwicke and he disliked Abbott ; but Pelham was an old friend of his, and he communicated his opinions freely to him.

Possibly there never was a man in prominent public life whose career exhibited greater vicissitudes of office and of estimate than Pelham's. Endowed with a great name historically connected with office, influence, and rank, he was the eldest son of Lord Chichester,

and had been for several years Chief Secretary in Ireland. His health was not good, and he constantly tried to resign, but was appealed to by all to stay on, as if he were an unreplaceable genius. Castlereagh was first named with hesitation as a temporary substitute, and then, also with hesitation, as an unequal successor, Lord Cornwallis modestly deprecating hostile criticism, saying that ‘as he is so very unlike an Irishman he has a great claim to an exception in his favour.’

Abbott would appear to have been an energetic and reforming Chief Secretary. He was very anxious to find out all about the different departments of Government—an apparently proper and reasonable matter on which to seek information. In his diary<sup>1</sup> he says : ‘In consequence of general conversations with Mr. Addington, and also upon this point with Mr. Pitt before I left England, I issued circular orders calling upon all the departments of Government to make returns of their establishments, duties, salaries, &c , in the same manner I had practised in the British Parliament when I was chairman of the Finance Committee.’

Clare at once denounced the proceeding in the most unmeasured language, and wrote the following violent letter<sup>2</sup> to Pelham, September 5, 1801 :

[*Private*]

Mount Shannon: September 5, 1801.

My dear Lord,—Enclosed I send you a copy of a circular letter which has been sent to every office in the Civil and Military Departments of this country by the Secretary of State for Ireland and the Chief Secretary.

<sup>1</sup> *Lord Colchester's Diary*, i. 280.

<sup>2</sup> *Pelham Papers*, British Museum, 33107, f. 428.

Although he makes use of Lord Hardwicke's name, I am well satisfied the act is altogether his own; and surely a more unwise, impolitic, and insolent proceeding never has taken place on the part of a Chief Secretary. I can scarcely suppose that it originated in Great Britain, and, even if it did, that Mr. Abbott can have any authority from thence to act with the unexampled arrogance which marks every part of his official conduct. Is there wisdom, justice, or policy in suffering this upstart prig to disgust and offend the gentlemen to whose support we are indebted for carrying the Union, before it has well been completed? I understand that Mr. Abbott, who commenced his official career by securing to himself a sinecure office in Ireland for life, has openly declared that he has come here for the sole purpose of effecting reformation in every department. Even if he were authorised to make such a declaration, how is the general inquisition which he has set on foot calculated to facilitate reformation? And if it were, how is his arrogance in the mode of carrying it into effect to be justified? I cannot see any object to be answered by his proceedings but to wound the feelings of the gentlemen of the country, and to make the conduct of public officers the subject of general cabal and general canvass. Surely Mr. Abbott ought to be satisfied in seeing that the public service shall be attended to as it ought to be by the king's servants—and that if retrenchment is to take place in the different departments, let it be carried into execution gradually, and with every circumstance of accommodation to individuals which may be consistent with the object.

But if the few persons in Ireland who are attached to the interests of Great Britain here find that they are, in consequence of the Union, to be held up as objects of censure and obloquy, if they are to feel themselves subject to the overbearing and petulant arrogance of such a man as Mr. Abbott, and if they find the alternative to rest between this sort of persecution and the surrender of all security for their political and natural existence in Ireland, it will be discovered, perhaps when it is too late, that the efforts of the real friends of the British Monarchy to preserve its integrity unimpaired will have been baffled by the unaccountable and thoughtless folly and versatility

of the councils adopted for the government of this country. I cannot describe to you the degree of despair which I feel when I look at the gloom which obscures a prospect that I had very lately considered as universally promising and bright.

Yours always very truly,

My dear Lord,

CLARE.

[CIRCULAR.]

Dublin Castle.

I have it in command from the Lord-Lieutenant to desire that you will transmit to me, with as little delay as possible, for the immediate information of His Excellency, a return of the establishment of your officers exactly corresponding with the enclosed form, and specifying correctly the information required in the respective columns thereof, when the headings severally apply to the establishment of your institution, or to any points connected therewith, and also to state the attendance and duties of the officers belonging thereto.

His Excellency further desires that the return now required from you may be completed *as if to be verified upon oath*, and that it may be signed by the proper officer or officers.

I have the honour, &c.,

C. A.

The form required number of officers, by whom appointed, how, when ; duration of interest (life, years, or pleasure) ; executed in person or by deputy, and if by deputy by what authority.

Salary : by whom paid ; increased salary or allowances ; fees, and by what authority ; by whom paid ; other emoluments ; from whence.

Deductions ; taxes ; pay to assistants.

Other public employments ; places or pensions under Government.

Reference to circulars as to hours of attendance and duties.

He again applied himself to the subject in a further letter<sup>1</sup> September 18, 1801 :

Mr. Abbott goes on very rapidly in all departments, civil and military, and seems to consider his Master and the Commander in Chief of the Forces as mere ciphers. If this gentleman is not controlled, and that very speedily, he will do more mischief here than you can be aware of. He has already contrived to give more offence in the short time that he has been in this country than I thought it possible for any fool or coxcomb to accomplish.

Clare did not long survive the Union, and died on January 26, 1802, after an illness of some duration, in Ely Place, Dublin, at the age of fifty-four. He had a large and imposing funeral, and there was ample evidence that he was widely regretted, and enjoyed much general respect and esteem.<sup>2</sup>

He was a man of imperious spirit, masterful character, powerful mind, and vigorous speech. He had great courage, iron nerve,<sup>3</sup> fearless independence, personal integrity, domestic affection, combined with some striking gifts. His desire to benefit Ireland according to his own conceptions of her position and

<sup>1</sup> *Pelham Papers*, British Museum, 33,108, f. 3.

<sup>2</sup> It is stated in O'Flanagan's *Lives of the Chancellors of Ireland* that there was a painful display of popular feeling on the occasion. This is plainly a vast exaggeration of possibly some trifling incident or exclamation. The funeral was on Sunday morning at St. Peter's, and there must have been an enormous crowd of idle and curious people in the neighbourhood quite uncontrolled. The Dublin papers of the time (*Faulkner's Dublin Journal*, the *Freeman's Journal*, the *Post*) all give full accounts of the funeral, and none of them suggest anything unseemly as occurring.

<sup>3</sup> Clare in a letter to Auckland, March 23, 1798, says: 'The newspaper accounts of the attack are much exaggerated. Some forty or fifty blackguards did follow me down Castle Hill, but as I never go unarmed, on my facing them suddenly with a pistol in my hand, they retreated with precipitation.'

wants was sincere. But he was unfortunately arrogant, overbearing, intolerant, and sometimes harsh. His conduct to Curran was unbecoming ; his treatment of Baron Power was hard. But he was capable of humanity, kindness, and generosity. As a judge he acted with great rapidity of decision and extraordinary power of concentration. He was firm and just, in favour of law reform, and opposed to legal abuses. Take him all in all, he was a great Irishman.<sup>1</sup>

Lord Kilwarden wrote before, and Lord Avonmore after, Clare's death to Pelham for the Great Seal ; but their energy was not rewarded, and John Mitford, Lord Redesdale, an eminent English equity lawyer, was appointed his successor.

Clare's private fortune and the large official income he had received for so many years enabled him to leave his family quite independent. His will, which was executed on December 11, 1800, is interesting, and shows the depth and earnestness of his family affections. The first and last paragraphs are in Clare's own handwriting. He left to his eldest son considerable landed property, and very ample portions to his second son and to his only daughter ; to his widow a legacy of 1,000*l.* in addition to her jointure of 1,100*l.* a year, and a large annual sum for the maintenance of her children during minority.

The following passages in the will show the seriousness of his character, and throw light on his real convictions :

I, John Earl of Clare, Lord Chancellor of Ireland, do make

<sup>1</sup> There is a most prejudiced account of Clare's career in Grattan's *Life* by his son (iii. chap. 18.)

this my last will and testament, hereby revoking all former wills made by me. I earnestly entreat pardon for my sins from Almighty God, I am truly and deeply sensible and grateful for the many blessings which through His mercy and goodness I have enjoyed in this world, and bow as becomes me with resignation to such afflictions as have been visited upon me; hoping through His mercy and mediation of my Redeemer, His most blessed Son, for salvation in the next world. . . .

The disposition which I make of my house and furniture in Ely Place arises from my conviction that my wife, if she survives me, will not reside in Ireland, more particularly as she knows it to be my earnest wish that the education of my dear children shall be completed in England, and I know her love of them will induce her to make that country her place of general residence. . . .

If I should not live to remove my books from my home in Ely Place to my house at Mount Shannon, which it is my intention to do if ever I shall see this giddy and distracted country at peace, they are to be sold; but if I live to remove them, they are to remain at Mount Shannon as heirlooms and the property of the possessor of the house. . . .

I do earnestly exhort my sons not to addict themselves to idleness or extravagance, and above all to keep clear of the abominable and pernicious vice of gambling. The injury which their fortunes will sustain by it is slight when compared with the corruption and depravity of mind and morals which it never fails to entail on every man who suffers it to take possession of him. . . .

It is my earnest wish, and I do warmly and earnestly recommend to my eldest son who shall be entitled to the said mansion house and demesne lands of Mount Shannon, to make the same his place of general residence. I request my friends whom I have hereby appointed trustees and executors of this my will, to assist with their advice and counsel my dear wife in everything that relates to her interests or the interests of my dear children, and I have firm confidence in her love for them and in her integrity and good dispositions that she will instil into their minds from their earliest years the principles of morality and the Christian religion, and above all others the

precepts of the same, the love of truth and justice, which they will find the best inheritance I can transmit to them. . . .

I earnestly entreat my dear and beloved children to cultivate the same attachment mutually to each other which I have always had to them all, and which my most worthy and respected father manifested in every stage of his life to his children: and I recommend most warmly to my dear sons, when they shall attain the age of men, to make the country which gave them birth the place of their general residence.

CLARE.

Notwithstanding the provision so made for herself and her children, Lady Clare applied to Pelham to aid her to get help from the State. Such a request would not now be made or listened to, but in those times different habits and ideas prevailed.

In her letter<sup>1</sup> of February 8, 1802, to Pelham, she said that her ‘own situation was most dreadful, as her husband had it not from his father’s will in his power to leave her in such a situation as he could have wished, and his ideas while he lived were such as to make him fill the situation in which His Majesty had so graciously placed him in such a manner that he yearly more than spent his income, but he always felt certain that Government would take care of me; but, as I before said, I am not half so anxious as to myself as to his children and his relation Mr. Fitzgibbon.’ She also said, ‘Upon what I most rest my claim is that all the family of Lord Chancellor Lifford were upon his death provided for.’

Pelham wrote a reply full of sympathy, but adroitly treated the business part of her letter as merely a

<sup>1</sup> *Pelham Papers*, British Museum, 33,109, f. 91. Nothing in Clare’s will suggests any need of assistance, or that he would have approved of such a letter.

recommendation of Mr. Fitzgibbon. He on the same day wrote to Lord Hardwicke commanding Mr. Fitzgibbon's claims, 'for I do not think anything could have been provided either for her or her children.' But she pressed her claims, and was ultimately granted a pension, no doubt aided by Pelham's friendship for her husband.

Pelham's own subsequent career is curious for a man who had been Secretary of State, and who had had the conduct of business in the House of Lords. His health was not good, and this possibly accounted for his having to give up the Secretaryship of State in August 1803, and—after somewhat of a wrangle for better terms—then taking the office of Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.

When Pitt resumed office in 1804, he quietly dropped Pelham out of his new Government in the following polite letter :<sup>1</sup>

[*Private*]

York Place: May 19, 1804.

My dear Lord,—I regret very much being under the necessity of acquainting your lordship that in forming the new plan of arrangements which I have been called on to submit to His Majesty I find it unavoidable to recommend to His Majesty to place in other hands the office now held by your Lordship of Chancellor of the Duchy. You will, I hope, believe that in taking this step I am actuated only by my view of what is necessary at this moment for the King's service, and that I feel great reluctance in proposing anything that is not perfectly agreeable to you. It will be my anxious desire to be enabled to propose to you some other situation (if such an one can be found) which may be acceptable to you, and may mark the sense I entertain of your services at a former period, when I had the satisfaction of acting with you in Government. I shall be very glad to be allowed an opportunity of conversing with

<sup>1</sup> *Pelham Papers*, British Museum, 33,112, f. 123.

you on this subject whenever it is consistent with your convenience to come to town.

I am, with great regard, my dear Lord,

Your Lordship's faithful and obedient Servant,

W. PITT.

Pitt had great gifts for making unpleasant matters smooth by gracious and graceful words. Nothing can be more skilful than his letter to the Duke of York<sup>1</sup> relieving him of his command, and thus ‘increasing the lustre of his personal reputation.’

Downing Street : Friday, August 29, 1794.

Mr. Windham, who will have the honour of delivering to Your Royal Highness this letter, is enabled so fully to explain to Your Royal Highness all the circumstances which have led His Majesty’s servants to feel the necessity of the proposed arrangement which he will communicate to Your Royal Highness, and the general grounds of them are so fully stated in a paper on the subject which has been submitted to His Majesty, and which Mr. Windham will also lay before Your Royal Highness, that it would be superfluous for me to trouble Your Royal Highness with any additional observations.

Allow me, sir, only to express a very earnest and sincere hope that a measure which seems to us to be of the utmost importance to the public service in this critical conjunction may also appear to Your Royal Highness, as it does to us, to furnish at the same time an opportunity of increasing the lustre of Your Royal Highness’s personal reputation and giving you an additional title to the increased gratitude and affection of the country.

I have the honour to be, etc.

W. PITT.

Pitt afterwards offered Pelham the Stick of Captain of Yeomen of the Guard, which he declined. The King, however, pressed the stick into his hands, saying that it was ‘from him : the other was a Ministerial arrangement’ ; but Pelham adhered to his refusal, and never held office again.

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*

## CHAPTER IX

## THE UNION

Thoughts of Union must have often passed through Pitt's mind—His letter to Westmoreland—His public life and Grattan's Parliament—Difficulty of Irish government—Commercial policy—The Regency—Fitzwilliam—Management of the Irish Parliament—The two religions—Conspiracies and invasions—The Rebellion—Previous attempts at Union—Advocates of Union—Decision of Government for Union—Letter to Cornwallis—Points to be considered—Evidence to be taken in Ireland in election petitions and private business—First debate—Lord Corry's motion—Government sought additional support—Composition of Irish House of Commons—Placeholders and pensioners—Dismissals and resignations—Scale of prices fixed for close boroughs—Then legal property, and so regarded—Pitt had proposed it for England—Opponents also paid for their boroughs—Other expenditure—Repudiation by Cornwallis—Not put forward in Irish Parliament—Increase of pensions—Vacating of seats—The known methods of Irish Government—New peerages—Would a new election have produced different results?—Competency of Parliament—The means and the justice different things—Great speeches—Grattan, Plunket, and Foster—Castlereagh—Pitt—Clare's speech—Foster's reply—Pitt's speech of April 21, 1800—Union taken quietly in Ireland—General election of 1802—Pitt's motives and aims—His conduct after the Union.

THOUGHTS of the Union and of its policy must have often passed through Pitt's mind. He had written<sup>1</sup> to Westmoreland in 1792: ‘The idea of the present fermentation gradually bringing both parties to think of an Union with this country has long been in my mind. I hardly dare flatter myself with the hope of its taking

<sup>1</sup> *Westmoreland Papers*, Dublin Record Office, letter of Pitt to Westmoreland, November 18, 1792: quoted by Mr. Lecky, vi. 513.



G.J. Stuart pinxit.

Walker & Sons delit. phot.

Right Hon. Henry Grattan.



place ; but I believe it, though itself not easy to be accomplished, to be the only solution for other and greater difficulties.

‘The admission of the Catholics to the share of suffrage could not then be dangerous. The Protestant interest—in point of power, property, and Church establishment—would be secure, because the decided majority of the supreme Legislature would necessarily be Protestant ; and the great ground of argument on the part of the Catholics would be done away, as, compared with the rest of the Empire, they would become a minority.’ The Union had grown into an urgent matter for consideration after the rebellion of 1798.

His own public life had commenced at the time that Grattan’s Parliament acquired its powers, and, speaking generally, it may be said that he was Prime Minister during its whole career. He had the greatest and the best personal opportunities of judging of it from the British or Imperial points of view. From the reports and correspondence of the Irish Executive he was aware of the difficulty of Irish government. He had had from time to time to consider how the two independent Parliaments could be got to work harmoniously in matters where unison of aim was essential and where difference of opinion was disastrous. He had found that ‘the Golden link’ often meant more gold than link, and the conviction had each year taken clearer shape in his mind that Union was the true policy.

He had seen his commercial policy—intended to secure united action on Imperial subjects—wrecked between the two independent Parliaments, the sport

of party in England, the victim of patriotism in Ireland.

He had seen the tie between the two countries strained, the slender connection severely tried, and the imminent possibility of the gravest and most far-reaching constitutional complications on the question of the Regency. The recovery of the King rescued the Empire from real perils. If the two Parliaments had selected as Regent even the same person with different powers, if war was popular in Ireland when England desired peace, if a different foreign policy was even possible in each country, if on the hundred questions where united action was needed there was diversity of opinion, how long would the Empire last without a civil war to establish which was the stronger?

The difficulties even of Fitzwilliam's short tenure showed what a storm might be raised in Ireland and almost between the two countries by an emotional Viceroy with ideas—difficulties which would at all events not be likely to arise in the same way if there was an united Parliament.

Then the management of the Irish Parliament was a tremendous question. If it remained an independent Parliament, there was always the risk of its flying off—being so independent that it would take no heed of Imperial or British interests or wishes or policy. If nothing at all was done, if the Irish Executive appointed from London took no part in trying to manage Parliament, might not the countries drift apart in action and in policy? This question of management—by places, pensions, offices, titles—which some might

compendiously call corruption, was a degrading, disagreeable, but essential question always with an Irish Executive. Pitt might think that an Union would get rid of it, and that it would be a blessing and a mercy to be free from the old odious negotiations—‘to buy up the fee simple of Irish corruption’<sup>1</sup>

He was quite alive, too, to the position of the two religions, with old jealousies and old associations: in many parts Protestant landowners and Catholic tenants, with an Established Church for the minority. He knew that Catholic relief and the question of tithes might be dealt with more certainly and evenly in a Parliament in London than in a Parliament in Dublin.

Then the agrarian conspiracies and outrages, the disloyalty and the treason, the invasions and invitations to invade, Ireland always ready from some shore of some province to hold out a hand to the enemies of the Empire and be an object for foreign intrigues—Pitt thought that all these matters would be bettered by an Union.

At last came the Rebellion, rousing fierce passions, stirring up religious animosities, setting religion against religion and class against class, showing once again the deadly danger of foreign invasion encouraged and aided from within. Things would not go on as they were; he thought the time ripe for the Union, and that an Imperial Parliament, with Ireland represented, would with strong and impartial hand keep the peace between the different races, religions, and interests which divided the country; cover all with its potent ægis; and at the

<sup>1</sup> Lord Castlereagh.

same time show the world that an united Empire spoke with one voice through one Parliament.

A vassal Parliament had been tried ; a Parliament of Protestants with its dependent independence had been tested ; the memory of the Catholic Parliament of James II. was not popular. Pitt determined on an united Parliament. His motives were patriotic, and Mr. Lecky<sup>1</sup> mentions the charge that the English Government had forced on the Rebellion as a means of effecting the union ‘as too wildly extravagant to require a lengthened refutation.’

Once before (not to refer to earlier periods), in Cromwell’s time, Irish members had sat at Westminster ; but that had not lasted long, and besides the times were revolutionary. The Irish Parliament in Anne’s reign had asked for Union. It was a known idea—supported by many, opposed by many. Many great writers and thinkers<sup>2</sup> had advocated it in the past, and, supported by his own experience, it entirely commended itself to Pitt’s mind.

The members of the Irish Government were strong advocates of the Union. Cornwallis gave it the sanction of his ripe judgment and his lofty character ; Clare, the Chancellor, was its hearty advocate ; Castlereagh—able, vigorous, intrepid, and determined—thoroughly believed in it. It was opposed by many whose names are entitled to be spoken of with respect—Grattan, Foster, Plunket, Parsons, Parnell, and Bushe.

<sup>1</sup> Lecky, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, viii. 283.

<sup>2</sup> Amongst authorities who wrote in favour of the Union are found the names of Petty, Brewster, Molyneux, Molesworth, Bishop Berkeley, Adam Smith, &c.

The English Government were thoroughly united in favour of it, and decided on December 21, 1798<sup>1</sup>—

That the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland should be instructed to state without delay to all the persons with whom he may have communication on the subject, that His Majesty's Government is decided to press the measure of an Union as essential to the well-being of both countries, and particularly to the security and peace of Ireland as dependent on its connection with Great Britain, to the utmost, and will even in the case (if it should happen) of any present failure be renewed on every occasion till it succeed, and that the conduct of individuals on this subject will be considered as the test of the disposition to support the King's Government.

In pursuance of this policy a long official letter<sup>2</sup> was written to the Lord-Lieutenant on December 24, 1798, from Whitehall, going in detail into the suggested provisions of the Union, and containing the following passage, which is of importance as showing how unswerving was the resolution of the Cabinet :

The report which Lord Castlereagh will make you of the conversations which he has had with Sir John Parnell will prove to Your Excellency our concurrence in your opinion respecting the propriety of bringing the leading members of Administration, and Sir John Parnell in particular, to a clear and distinct avowal of their sentiments and intentions with regard to the Union ; and I desire to assure Your Excellency, in the most explicit and unqualified terms, that every one of the King's servants, as well as myself, will consider themselves individually obliged to use their best endeavours to fulfil whatever engagements Your Excellency may find it necessary or deem it expedient to enter into for the purpose or with a view of accomplishing the Union of Great Britain and Ireland.

It is obvious that the Government applied itself to

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*

<sup>2</sup> *Castlereagh Correspondence*, ii. 53.

consider all the matters that were likely to be of importance in working out such a great question.

There is in existence<sup>1</sup> a paper of ‘Points to be considered with a view to an incorporating Union of Great Britain and Ireland,’ which contains the following :

4. An appeal (in all cases when it now lies to the House of Lords) to lie to the Lord Chancellor and three chief judges in Ireland, with power to them to permit an appeal in doubtful cases to the House of Lords of the United Kingdom, and with power also to the House of Lords on special grounds shown, and for preserving uniformity in the law of the two Kingdoms, to remove the cause before them after the decision of that Court of Appeal.

5. Power to the same court to examine evidence and certify all preliminaries and other points for private Bills. This power might be extended . . . so as to diminish the objection of the expense of resort to Parliament here for such private business as is now transacted by the Irish Parliament.

It is plain that on the discussion of these points the Cabinet had decided at all events in favour of making an effort to try and save expenses by means of local inquiries, and thus obviate resort on such matters to Parliament.

There is also amongst Pitt’s papers the following interesting ‘note respecting evidence to be taken in Ireland’ :

One of the greatest difficulties, however, which has been supposed to attend the project of Union between the two kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland is that of the expense and trouble which will be occasioned by the attendance of witnesses

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.* The paper has notes in red ink by Pitt.

in trials of controverted elections or in matters of private business requiring Parliamentary interposition. It would, therefore, be very desirable to devise a plan (which does not appear impossible) for empowering the Speaker of either House of the United Parliament to issue his warrant to the chairman of the Quarter Sessions in Ireland, or to such other person as may be thought more proper for the purpose, requiring him to appoint a time and place within the county for his being attended by the agents of the respective parties, and reducing to writing in their presence the testimony (or the consents or dissents, as the case may be) of such persons as by the said agents may be summoned to attend, being resident within the county. (If not there resident, a similar proceeding should take place in the county where they do reside.) And such testimony so taken and reduced to writing may by such chairman, or by the sheriff of the county, be certified to the Speaker of either House as the case may be. It seems difficult to provide by a detailed Article of the Union for all the various regulations which such a proceeding may require, but the principle might perhaps be stated then, and the provisions left to be stated by the United Parliament. All questions respecting the admissibility, competency, or credibility of such evidence so certified must of course still remain with the House or Committee to whom it is to be produced; but it does not appear that in such cases there is any benefit of *viva voce* testimony which might not equally be obtained by written evidence in this form.

In arranging the details it may probably be useful to consult the provisions now subsisting by different acts respecting the procuring evidence in like manner for the East Indies.

This note is endorsed 'Irish Union—note respecting evidence to be taken in Ireland—sent to Lord Castle-reagh December 18, 1798; ' and it is embodied in the official letter of December 24, 1798, already referred to.

It was resolved to bring forward the measure in

the Irish Parliament in 1799. In the first trial of the question the debate was powerful and interesting ; the motion for the Union was only carried by a majority of one, whilst two days later their sole victory was won by the Anti-Unionists by a majority of six.

On February 15, the Opposition,<sup>1</sup> elated by their success, put up Lord Corry to move that the House should resolve itself into a Committee of the whole House to take into consideration the state of the nation—meaning to propose an address to the King to express the opinion of the Irish House of Commons against the Union, to counteract Pitt's resolutions at Westminster. They failed, however, and were beaten by 123 to 103, showing the instability of the position, and that without any new elections the House declined within a very short time after its earlier vote to place upon the 'Journals' any lasting pledge against the Union.

The matter then stood over until the next session, and the Government—mainly through Lord Castle-reagh—applied itself in the interim to secure additional support. What was done in this direction has caused fierce denunciations ; and the usages of those days too readily lend themselves to criticism and reproach.

But there are no close boroughs now, and therefore no owners of close boroughs to be dealt with and considered, and the methods adopted in 1800 could not now be repeated and would not now be tolerated. The means then used openly as a matter of business

<sup>1</sup> *Beresford Correspondence*, ii. 214, Beresford to Auckland, February 16, 1798.

suggest painful reflections as to the times and conditions which permitted or made them possible.

The Irish House of Commons was composed of 300 members—of whom 124 were nominated by fifty-two peers, and sixty-four by thirty-six commoners. In the not very attractive private history of the Parliament the Irish Government had always largely looked to and dealt with the owners of the seats. It was one of the familiar methods of management—now simply impossible. The matter had to be looked at from the point of view then prevailing.

There was also in Parliament an army of place-holders and pensioners. These men had always been expected to be obsequious in their politics. No one can and no one does defend the system. It was debasing and lowering to all honourable, genuine public life, but it was the system in 1799. If these men indulged in the luxury of independence, they knew the penalty. Flood after a silence of years, official and deliberate, at last spoke against the Government and lost his place. The same thing happened to Hussey Burgh and many others.

Of course, men holding high political offices, such as the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Prime Sergeant, stood on a different footing. *Virtute officii* loyalty and support were expected naturally by the Government, and if denied they were liable not unnaturally to immediate dismissal. The dismissals, however, as distinguished from resignations at this period were not very considerable.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Seven only appear to have been dismissed from offices held during

The proprietors of the close boroughs had to be approached. They could not be expected to consent to the destruction of their property—one of the reasons that influenced some on the first division to vote against the Union. Was it reasonable to think that any owners would ever quietly submit to the loss of property which was recognised everywhere? Castlereagh thought they should be compensated, and he applied himself to ascertain the scale of prices that should be paid for this species of property. It is very painful to think that such rights were ever regarded as mere private property and as matters of purchase; but the property in human beings—at which all nature revolts—was compensated for by millions when the negroes were emancipated. Did the fact that the property in close boroughs was to be compensated in money suggest a holier horror? Pitt had made a like proposition (amounting to a million) for England in his scheme for Parliamentary reform. They were regarded as property to be bought, sold, settled and devised, like any other species of property. This transaction involved the expenditure of a very large sum of money, which went impartially amongst all the owners affected—opponents as well as supporters of the Government.<sup>1</sup> No tangible evidence of any other

pleasure: Parnell, Chancellor of the Exchequer; Fitzgerald, Prime Sergeant; Col. Foster, son of the Speaker; and four others. Pitt, writing on January 26, 1799, said of Col. Foster: ‘In particular it strikes me as essential not to make an exception to this line in the instance of the Speaker’s son. No Government can stand on safe and reputable ground which does not show that it feels itself independent of him’ (Ingram, *History of the Irish Union*, p. 201).

<sup>1</sup> Ingram’s *History of the Irish Union*; see also Lecky’s *History*. The anti-Unionists were paid 484,000*l.* Each borough was valued at

expenditure of money for the purpose of buying votes for the Union is to be found.<sup>1</sup> No such charge even was put forward in the Irish Parliament or at the time. The Union naturally brought a large number of offices to an end, and considerable expenditure had to be sanctioned to save the holders from loss, but this was done openly by statutes.<sup>2</sup> A large part of the increase of pensions can be thus explained.

The vacating of seats between the two sessions has been attacked, but it was merely an exaggerated development of the then ordinary methods of manage-

15,000*l.*; each half-borough at 7,500*l.*, which was said to be rather less than full market value. In England such property brought much higher prices—quite openly.

<sup>1</sup> Cornwallis repudiated the idea (*Correspondence*, iii. 84): ‘The enemy, to my certain knowledge, offer 5,000*l.* ready money for a vote. If we had the means, and were disposed to make such vile use of them, we dare not trust the credit of Government in the hands of such rascals.’ The accusation of corruption was grappled with by the Government and its supporters in both Houses of Parliament, and the Opposition was challenged to prove it. In the House of Lords the Chancellor, Lord Clare, on February 10, 1800, accused the anti-Unionists of having opened an exchequer “for foul and undisguised bribery,” and named two members who were present in connection with his objection. These members attempted to defend themselves, but no counter-charge was brought forward. . . . In the Commons the Prime Sergeant threw down the glove on January 15, 1800, . . . and ended his speech with these words: “It was base to be bribed—very base; but it was baser to make the charge when it was known to be false.” The glove thus thrown down was not taken up in either House. . . . The accusations of the Opposition at the time of the Union were vague and general, and were based on three circumstances—the compensation for boroughs; the dismissal of officers and the promotions consequent on their dismissals; and the alleged terms offered to the Protestant, Catholic, and Presbyterian Churches’ (Ingram, *History of Irish Union*, pp. 226–7).

<sup>2</sup> Plowden, in an appendix, gives a long list of Irish Parliamentary annuities granted ‘as a compensation for their respective losses by reason of the discontinuance of their emoluments or offices as officers or attendants of the two Houses of Parliament.’ Foster, the Speaker, got an annuity of over 5,000*l.*

ment. Some accepted office and vacated their seats; but the greater number of seats were vacated because their owners had gone over to the Union—no doubt influenced by the knowledge that their property was recognised and would be paid for. It is undeniable that the value of boroughs owned by these men had then a large market price. The system adopted by Castlereagh to insure an adequate majority is opposed to all present notions of public life. ‘But,’<sup>1</sup> as Lord Rosebery says, ‘it must in fairness be remembered that this was the only method known of carrying an Irish Government; the only means of passing any measure through an Irish Parliament; that, so far from being an exceptional plan of politics, it was only three or four years of Irish administration rolled into one.’

The number of peerages given was considerable,<sup>2</sup> but this was also an ordinary incident of Irish political life all through the eighteen years of Grattan’s Parliament. It is impossible to take up any correspondence of the time without finding the most open demands for peerages and for promotions in the peerage. Peerages were then given with great facility. Clare, who was entitled by his eminence, was made a Baron, then a Viscount, then an Earl. But Archbishop Agar, and Scott and Toler, who were less prominent, also equally bounded up by similar steps to earldoms.

<sup>1</sup> *Pitt*, by Lord Rosebery.

<sup>2</sup> Twenty new Irish peerages were created, sixteen peers were promoted in the peerage, and four peers were given English peerages. But it was certainly the custom of that period to create peers rather freely. Thus Lord North in 1779 is said to have ‘on one day and on no special occasion created eighteen Irish peerages, raised five viscounts and seven barons a step in the peerage’ (*Ingram’s History of Irish Union*, p. 194). See Lecky, iv. 441. English peerages were then also created very freely (May, *Const. Hist.* i. 233).

It is said that there should have been a new election on the question. Would it—could it—have produced different results? The owners of seats were satisfied to get the price of their boroughs, and their nominees would have voted for the Union in a new Parliament just as well as in the existing one. There was a kind of general election at the beginning of the session of 1800, when writs were moved for a large number of seats vacated during the recess. The new members returned were ‘stalwarts’ for the Union. A general election for the whole of Ireland would probably have shown a greater majority.

The competency of the Irish Parliament to pass such a measure has been keenly debated. The legal power seems clear, and constitutionally it is not easy to see how a limit can be placed on the power of an independent Parliament; but as men support or oppose the Union, so they will, to the end of time, take sides on this question.

The means by which the Union was carried in the Irish Parliament is one thing, the consideration of whether it was just or right is another thing. Pitt was not directly much concerned with the former; but his responsibility for the measure itself, its reason, its fairness, its necessity, is palpable and acknowledged.

Its course in the two Parliaments is interesting, and is noted fully in familiar works of authority. But as any book on Pitt would be incomplete which omitted some reference to the Union, so it is necessary in such references to allude to some of the great speeches which made part of the history of the transaction.

Though Grattan’s speeches were most eloquent and

emotional, and Plunket's powerful and impressive, Foster, the Speaker, made probably the most able and effective arguments against the Union. They can be read to-day with great admiration for his sincerity, his patriotism, his knowledge and ability. His two great speeches against the Union—the first, delivered on the Regency Bill, deemed a reply to Pitt, and the second, delivered in Committee on the Union Bill, deemed a reply to Lord Clare—really say all that can be said on the subject, and present the whole case against the Union from the political, economic, and social points of view, with fulness, lucidity, and force. He spoke with all the more weight on account of his close connection for years with Irish Government and his high character. His testimony was regarded as the more impartial because he was a strong Protestant who had opposed the Catholic claims, who had been hostile to Abercromby, and who had supported stern measures after the Rebellion. Clare, Castlereagh, and William Smith made the most powerful arguments for the Union, in Ireland.

Pitt, on January 31, 1799, made his great speech at Westminster moving the resolutions for the Union—a most powerful, exhaustive, and elaborate statement of the case. It met with no effective answer in the assembly to which it was addressed, though Sheridan (Fox taking no part) made an eloquent speech—not so much on the merits of the Union, as on the occasion and circumstances under which it was proposed. The real answer was in the speech of Foster, already referred to, delivered at College Green, which boldly took issue on all Pitt's arguments, and vigorously

denied the advantages which were held forth as likely to result from the Union.

Lord Clare's speech proposing the resolution for the Union was delivered in the Irish House of Lords on February 10, 1800. He took four hours, and his address was obviously prepared with most elaborate care. It is very powerful, but goes rather much into detail, shows strong feelings against the Roman Catholic religion, and little toleration towards those who differed from him in opinion. He manifestly entertained the most sincere opinion that the measure was just and necessary. His words were clear :

I feel a strong conviction that nothing but Union can save this kingdom from annihilation and eventually uphold the stability of the British Empire. . . . From a critical and attentive observation of what has passed in Ireland for the last twenty years, I am satisfied in my judgment and conscience that the existence of her independent Parliament has gradually led to her recent complicated and bitter calamities, and that it has at length become desperate and impracticable. . . . In every communication which I have had with the King's Ministers on Irish affairs for the last seven years I have uniformly and distinctly pressed upon them the urgent necessity of Union as the last resource to preserve this country to the British Crown.

He sketched vigorously the connection between the two countries ; the early policy of the English Government, the failure to extend the Reformation in Ireland, the history of the Irish Parliaments and of the confiscations. Upon the forfeitures he founded one of his most telling arguments :

What, then, was the situation of Ireland at the Revolution ? and what is it at this day ? The whole power and property of

the country has been conferred by successive monarchs of England upon an English Colony, composed of three sects of English adventurers, who poured into this country at the termination of three successive rebellions. Confiscation is their common title, and from their first settlement they have been hemmed in on every side by the old inhabitants of the island, brooding over their discontents in sullen indignation. It is painful to me to go into this detail, but we have been for twenty years in a fever of intoxication, and must be stunned into sobriety. What, then, was the security of the English settlers for their physical existence at the Revolution? and what is the security of their descendants at this day? The powerful and commanding protection of Great Britain. If by any fatality it fails, you are at the mercy of the old inhabitants of the island.

He pointed out that when the idea of the Union was scouted in Queen Anne's reign, 'in finding a substitute there was a race of impolicy between the two countries. The Parliament of England seems to have considered the permanent debility of Ireland as their best security for her connection with the British Crown, and the Irish Parliament to have rested the security of the Colony upon maintaining a perpetual and impassable barrier against the ancient inhabitants of the country.'

He reviewed the times of the Volunteers, the failure of the commercial resolutions of 1785, the Regency question, the proceedings of the Catholic Committee, and Lord Fitzwilliam's Viceroyalty. He made no attempt at concealing his opinion of the Roman Catholic religion, which coloured his whole public life :

My unaltered opinion is that so long as human nature and the Popish religion continue to be what I know they are, a conscientious Popish ecclesiastic never will become a well-attached subject to a Protestant State, and that the Popish clergy must always have a commanding influence on every

member of that communion. I put it as an abstract State maxim without regard to the peculiar situation of this country ; and if experience were wanting, I have it abundantly to confirm me in the justice of it. In private life I never inquire into the religion of any man.

He dealt eloquently with the suggestion ‘Let the British Minister leave us to ourselves ; we are very well as we are.’

Gracious God ! of what material must the heart of that man be composed who knows the state of the country, and who coldly tells us we are very well as we are ? We are very well as we are ! We have not three years of redemption from bankruptcy or intolerable taxation, nor one hour’s security against the renewal of exterminating civil war. We are very well as we are ! Look at your statute-book. Session after session have you been compelled to enact laws of unexampled rigour and novelty to repress the horrible excesses of the mass of your people, and the fury of murder and pillage and desolation has so outrun all legislative exertion that you have been at length driven to the hard necessity of breaking down the pale of the military law and putting your country under the ban of municipal government ; and in every little circle of dignity and independence we hear whispers of discontent at the temperate discretion with which it is administered. We are very well as we are ! Look at the old Revolutionary Government of the Irish Union and the modern Revolutionary Government of the Irish Consulate, canvassing the dregs of the rebel democracy for a renewal of popular ferment and outrage to overcome the deliberations of Parliament. We are very well as we are ! Look to your civil and religious dissensions—look to the fury of political faction and the torrents of human blood that stain the face of your country, and of what material is that man composed who will not listen with patience and goodwill to any proposition that can be made to him for composing the distractions, and healing the wounds, and alleviating the miseries of this devoted nation ?

After stating the relief he believed Ireland would

acquire by the Union, he dealt with the allegation that by giving up a separate Government and Parliament national dignity would be sacrificed :

If gentlemen who enlarge on this theme will talk of their personal dignity and aggrandisement I can understand them ; but when I look at the squalid misery and profound ignorance and barbarous manners and brutal ferocity of the mass of the Irish people, I am sickened with this rant of Irish dignity and independence. Is the dignity and independence of Ireland to consist in the continued depression and unredeemed barbarism of the great majority of the people and the factious contentions of a puny and rapacious oligarchy, who consider the Irish nation as their political inheritance, and are ready to sacrifice the public peace and happiness to their insatiate love of patronage and power ? I hope I feel, as becomes a true Irishman, for the dignity and independence of my country, and therefore I would elevate her to her proper station in the rank of civilised nations. I wish to advance her from the degraded post of a mercenary province to the proud station of an integral and governing member of the greatest Empire in the world. I wish to withdraw the higher orders of my countrymen from the narrow and corrupted sphere of Irish politics, and to direct their attention to objects of national importance ; to teach them to improve the national energies and extend the resources of their country ; to encourage manufacturing skill and ingenuity, and open useful channels for commercial enterprise ; and, above all, seriously to exert their best efforts to tame and civilise the lower orders of the people ; to inculcate in them habits of religion, and morality, and industry, and due subordination ; to relieve their wants and correct their excesses. Unless you will civilise your people, it is in vain to look for national tranquillity and contentment.

The speech was very able and vigorous, very characteristic and confident, never suggesting the possibility of doubt or uncertainty or hesitation ; still of too great length, dealing too exhaustively with all topics and

going somewhat into too much detail. But it had great weight, it was widely read, and it was one of the most powerful statements of the case for the Union. It cannot, however, be placed before<sup>1</sup> and possibly not on a level with Pitt's.

Clare's speech was delivered on February 10, 1800, in the Irish House of Lords, and it was practically replied to on the 17th in the Irish House of Commons by Foster in a singularly able speech.

He boldly denied that the situation of Ireland was so desperate or so hopeless as painted ; vindicated the position of the people, asserted the success of the Constitution of 1782, and utterly dissented from Clare's views and prophecies as to finance. He entirely denied that Ireland was on the verge of bankruptcy, that her finances were in ruin or that the Union would improve them, and he resolutely asserted that the Union would increase the taxation.

He foretold many serious disasters from the removal of the Parliament from Dublin, and said the Union ‘leaves us every appendage of a kingdom except what constitutes the essence of independence, a resident Parliament. Separate State, separate Establishment, separate Exchequer, separate debt, separate Courts, separate laws, the Lord-Lieutenant, and the Castle, all remain.’

He prophesied that revenue and trade would not stay after the Union ; but, if they remained, it would not affect his judgment. ‘I declare most solemnly that if England could give us all her revenue and all her trade, I would not barter for them the free Constitution of my

<sup>1</sup> The Rt. Hon. J. T. Ball regarded Pitt's speech as the best.

country. Our wealth, our properties, our personal exertions, are all devoted to her support. Our freedom is our inheritance, and with it we cannot barter.'

He was entirely opposed to compensating the borough owners as unconstitutional, denied that the Union would bring tranquillity or assuage religious differences, and asserted the right to hold county meetings to enable constituencies to express their real sentiments. He said all that could be said on the subject, and his speech should be read with attention by all who wish to master the debates on the Union.

On April 21, 1800, Pitt<sup>1</sup> in the House of Commons appealed for a large and broad view of his achievement :

If we wish to accomplish the great work we have undertaken we must look to the whole of this important and complicated question ; we must look at it from a large and comprehensive point of view ; we must consider it as a measure of great national policy, the object of which is effectually to counteract the restless machinations of an inveterate enemy who has uniformly and anxiously endeavoured to effect a separation between the two countries, whose connection is as necessary for the safety of the one as it is for the prosperity of the other. We must look to this as the only measure we can adopt which can calm the dissensions, allay the animosities, and dissipate the jealousies which have unfortunately existed ; as a measure whose object is to communicate to the sister kingdom the skill, the capital, and the industry which have raised this country to such a pitch of opulence ; to give to her a full participation of the commerce and of the Constitution of England ; to unite the affections and resources of two powerful nations, and to place under one public will the direction of the whole force of the Empire. We must regard this as a measure, Sir, the object of which is to afford an effectual remedy for those imperfections

<sup>1</sup> *Pitt's Speeches* (Hathaway), 4 vols.

which exist in that precarious system that at present binds the two countries together—a system which, if an incorporate Union should unfortunately not take place, may ultimately tend to their separation.

When the Union became law, there were no signs of the general dissatisfaction in Ireland that was so freely anticipated by its opponents. On the contrary, it was on the whole taken very quietly ; there was no agitation, and at the general election of 1802 no member lost his seat on account of having supported the Union.

The Union was a great measure—the most important of Pitt's life and policy. Opinions may differ as to the time selected for its enactment, as to the means employed, as to the measure itself; but no one can deny its importance or the largeness of its conceptions. Its author's motives and aims have been impugned ; but impartial history will not deny that he was influenced by true and generous motives of public spirit, and that he himself believed he was acting for the best interests of the Empire and of Ireland.

It is no part of the purpose of this short chapter to enter into the keen political controversies as to how far the Union has answered and come up to all the expectations of Pitt. But to his own conduct after the Union has been ascribed the incompleteness, the tardiness, of its good results ; and it is reasonable and indeed essential to see whether that conduct fairly satisfied the great requirements of the position, fulfilled the expectations he had evoked, and was worthy of a great statesman wielding vast power. His warmest admirer, in considering his career after the Union, has to use much more the language of explanation than of eulogy.

## CHAPTER X

## PITT AFTER 1800

Pitt's Irish programme—What he had given to be understood—‘Catholic emancipation’—Pitt did not act with resolution—Moral obligation—Castlereagh summoned to London—Pitt's letter to Loughborough—Disclosed to King—Loughborough's explanation—Pitt did nothing to influence King—Importance of tithe commutation—No justification for its neglect—Provision for Catholic clergy—Pitt's excuse inadequate—Castlereagh's letter of January 1, 1801—King's language at Levee—Pitt's letter to King, January 31, 1801—King's reply and further correspondence—Resignation—Public surprise—Tomline's memorandum—Pitt's letter to his brother—To Tomline—Either of two courses fairly open to Pitt—Took neither—Sir G. C. Lewis's view—Letter of Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire—King's reception of Pitt at Levee—Pitt soon wavered as to pledge of future conduct—Interview with Tomline—Letter of Rose to King—Addington—King's attack—Pitt's message through Dr. Wallis—Canning's letter—Pitt perplexed—Fair conduct to Catholics—Letter of Dundas to Pelham—No adjustment—And Addington takes office—Pitt's sincerity—Residence at Walmer—Lady Hester Stanhope—Eldon's conduct—His correspondence with Pitt—Opinions of Lord Campbell and of Milman, Brougham and Lord Rosebery—Pitt's own conduct throughout open—His acceptance of Government—King's objection to Fox—Fox's friends—Pitt forms weak Government—Lord Grenville's letter—Pitt's conduct in yielding to King—His difficulties—Entitled to sympathy.

THE Act for the Irish Union received the Royal Assent in the English Parliament on July 2, 1800, and then it was necessary for Pitt to consider carefully how and when he would apply himself to carry out and complete his Irish programme. It was not the case of an express promise or contract or pledge, but he had given it to be understood, and he knew it was most



After Lawrence, paint.

Walter & Sons publish

Viscount Castlereagh.



naturally expected, that he had in view after the Union some measures to complete Catholic relief,<sup>1</sup> to pay a part of their stipend to the Catholic clergy out of money provided by the State, and lastly to deal with the pressing grievance of Irish tithes. It must be confessed that he did not apply himself to any of them with promptness, energy, or resolution. The tithe grievance he never touched, the payment of the Catholic clergy he hardly hinted at, and Catholic relief was treated by him without nerve or vigour. He did not intend to ‘keep the word of promise to the ear and break it to the hope.’ He was not dishonest or intending to break faith, but he did not act in the matter like a strong man who meant to effect his purpose, and who would not be denied. His own health was not good ; he had not quite the energy, the decision, or the vigour of early days ; and he shrank from taking a resolute stand against the King.

Pitt remembered and recognised the moral obligations he had incurred, and summoned Lord Castlereagh to London in September 1800, to join in the discussions on the subject. He wrote on September 25, 1800, to Lord Loughborough, who was then at Weymouth with the King, announcing a Cabinet and saying ‘the chief points, besides the great question of the general state

<sup>1</sup> Pitt resolutely repudiated the correctness of the expression ‘Catholic emancipation.’ In the debate on July 25, 1801, he said : ‘I do not now understand the situation of the Catholics to be such as that any relief for it could be correctly so described, but I think the few remaining benefits of which they have not yet participation might have been added safely to the many benefits which have been so bounteously conferred on them in the course of the present reign.’ The position of Irish Catholics was far better then than that of their English and Scotch co-religionists.

of the Catholics, relate to some arrangement about tithes and a provision for the Catholic and Dissenting clergy.' The Chancellor promptly disclosed<sup>1</sup> Pitt's letter to the King, and, without any communication to his colleagues, strengthened and increased the old objections of George III. to any concessions to the Catholics, and encouraged and prepared him for resistance whenever the matter should be formally presented to him. When the Cabinet met, on September 30, Loughborough openly opposed the admission of Catholics to Parliament or office, whilst strongly advocating a measure to deal with the tithe grievance. Other members of the Cabinet were also either not friendly to or lukewarm on the Catholic claims ; and when the council broke up, no resolution had been come to, and the whole question was quietly adjourned until January.

Loughborough at once again applied himself to foment the King's prejudices, and submitted an able and plausible memorandum to him against any further concession to the Catholics. Pitt did nothing. He should have at once seen that there was no time to be wasted, that he had a resolute and unscrupulous opponent working against him. He knew the King and the anti-Catholic opinions he had expressed in the time

<sup>1</sup> Lord Campbell thinks Loughborough behaved disingenuously and in breach of good faith. There were so many rumours afloat at the time that he had acted unfairly and betrayed his colleagues, he wrote and circulated among his friends a laboured and lame explanation of his conduct. And yet the King neither liked nor trusted him, and his biographer says that on being satisfied he was dead 'His Majesty was graciously pleased to exclaim, "Then he has not left a greater knave behind him in my dominions "' (*Lives of the Lord Chancellors*).

of the Viceroyalties of Westmoreland and Fitzwilliam, and more recently when Cornwallis went to Ireland. It was to the last degree imprudent<sup>1</sup> not at once to have applied himself to open the matter and from his own fair and reasonable standpoint to seek to convince George III., or by resolute language to show that he could support no other alternative. He could then have calmly and at his leisure examined his position ; carefully weighed the chances of overcoming the King's obstinacy, as he had done on other troublesome occasions, by firmness; and considered whether, if the obstacles in the way of further concessions to the Catholics could not then be overcome, he would not at all events apply himself to the two other measures before coming to a final break, and resigning.

Far the most important of the three questions for the peace and the material advantage of the Irish people was tithe commutation. It was a grievance that came home to mind and pocket. It was a hardship of long standing, known to all, denied by none. Grattan had framed a scheme for relief; the Duke of Rutland had years before appealed to Pitt to take it up; Lord Loughborough had drafted a Bill. Pitt could have readily passed a measure settling the question without difficulty or opposition. He never once tried, or lifted a finger, to remedy this great and admitted grievance, and it is impossible to suggest a real justification for the neglect.

The provision for the Catholic and Dissenting clergy,

<sup>1</sup> Rose agrees with Lord Malmesbury that Pitt was careless in not preparing the King's mind gradually on the Catholic question (*Diaries and Correspondence of Right Hon. George Rose*).

too, was a measure of importance, at that time desired and feasible. It might have a considerable and beneficial effect on the peace, contentment, and future of Ireland. It might not have passed as easily as a tithe commutation Bill, but it would not have excited any grave opposition.<sup>1</sup> Pitt knew all this; his mind had been directed to the subject for a considerable time. Yet he did nothing, and never seriously tried to do anything, on the subject.

His sole excuse for doing nothing in reference to these two important matters must be sought for in the fact that, having failed in his proposals for Catholic relief, he did not see his way to do anything. The excuse, no doubt, represents Pitt's views; but it can hardly be regarded as adequate or satisfactory, as the measures were quite separate and in no way dependent upon one another. The excuse, such as it is, would have more force if it could be shown that he threw all his power into a relief Bill, and that he fought for it with resolution, courage, and perseverance. He resigned indeed, but he did little else.

In anticipation of the renewed Cabinet meetings Castlereagh deemed it right on behalf of Lord Cornwallis and himself to remind Pitt in the fullest, clearest, and most powerful way of what, with the full sanction of Pitt and the Cabinet, they had done in Ireland to enlist Catholic support for the Union by holding out expectations for further Catholic relief being granted

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*, Rose to Bishop Tomline, July 31, 1803: 'The Irish business is heart-breaking. Why the intended provision has not been made for the Catholic clergy I cannot tell, as all agreed in the propriety and expediency of that.'

by the new Imperial Parliament. The letter<sup>1</sup> is a long and powerful recapitulation of the facts. It is fully set out in many works, and it contains the following clear passage : ‘The instructions which I was directed to convey to Lord Cornwallis were to the following effect: that His Excellency was fully warranted in soliciting every support the Catholics could afford ; that he need not apprehend, as far as the statements of the Cabinet were concerned, being involved in the difficulty which that body seemed to apprehend ; that it was not thought expedient at that time to give any direct assurance to the Catholics, but that should circumstances so far alter as to induce His Excellency to consider such an explanation necessary, he was at liberty to state the grounds on which his opinion was founded for the consideration of the Cabinet.’ The narrative in the letter shows the strong moral case by which Pitt was bound and influenced, and which he had, if possible, to satisfy.

The opponents of Catholic relief in the Cabinet increased and grew more bold, and the King, encouraged by the Chancellor and Archbishops, became more outspoken in his objections. At his Levee on January 28, 1801, he spoke loudly and openly against even the suggestion of such a measure, and Pitt became thoroughly aware, not only that he should act at once, but also that he would have to encounter all the opposition that the long-trained experience of George III. knew how to make most effective.

<sup>1</sup> The letter is dated January 1, 1801, and is set out at length in the Cornwallis and Castlereagh correspondence.

It was under these discouraging circumstances that Pitt on January 31, 1801, wrote his well-known letter<sup>1</sup> to the King urging a measure for the admission of Catholics to Parliament and office, subject to clear tests to safeguard the established constitution in Church and State, and saying he would resign if not permitted to carry it out, as the policy ‘was unalterably fixed in his mind, and must ultimately guide his political conduct.’ The letter was dignified and becoming, but its tone and language conveyed that Pitt was prepared for failure and that the King would have little difficulty in ‘forming a new arrangement.’ George III. was too trained and astute a politician not at once to see that Pitt did not expect him to yield, and that he did not mean resolutely to assert his convictions in and out of office. Although his reply to Pitt of February 1 was thoroughly friendly—mentioning the Coronation Oath and his ‘sense of religious as well as political duty,’ and ‘his great regret’ if Pitt should resign, the King in no way showed that he anticipated the slightest difficulty in having the Government carried on without him. Pitt in his second letter, of February 3, insisted on his resignation, but never sought to argue or discuss the question, or to point out that the tests he contemplated would thoroughly protect the Established Church and could be so framed as to meet the King’s religious objections (he may have felt it was then too late); and he used the comforting words—calculated to dispel all alarm in the King’s mind—‘he trusts and sincerely believes that Your Majesty cannot find any long delay

<sup>1</sup> Stanhope’s *Life of Pitt*, vol. iii. Appendix.

necessary for forming an arrangement for conducting your service with credit and advantage.' The King on February 5 accepted Pitt's resignation, saying in his letter: 'I must come to the unpleasant decision, as it will deprive me of his political service, of acquainting him that, rather than forego what I look on as my duty, I will without unnecessary delay attempt to make the most creditable arrangement and such as Mr. Pitt will think most to the advantage of my service, as well as to the security of the public.'

The whole matter came as a surprise to the public and to Pitt's colleagues. On February 5, 1801, he wrote<sup>1</sup> as follows to Lord Chatham:

Downing Street: Feb. 5, 1801.

My dear Brother,—I have been wishing to write to you every day this week, but the particular subject on which I was most anxious to do so has added so much to all the other occupations of this busy time as has literally left me not a moment to dispose of. We have both had experience enough of times of difficulty not to be unprepared to encounter anything, however unexpected. I am sure, therefore, that without any preface the best thing I can do is to put you at once in possession, as far as I can, of the transaction to which I refer.

You left town before we had resumed in Cabinet the consideration of the Catholic Question, on which during the last

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.* The Bishop gave a good deal of consideration to this period. There is a curious and interesting memorandum amongst his papers, written in July 1802, 'relative to Mr. Pitt's going out of office and Mr. Addington's conduct,' and he there says: 'It is a sign of the pure and unsuspecting mind of Mr. Pitt that the only person he consulted upon this occasion was Mr. A. (Addington), although he knew that if he did resign Mr. A. would be his successor.' It is manifest from the whole tone of the memorandum that the Bishop did not approve of Addington's conduct to Pitt on this occasion, or, indeed, during his administration. He also left a shorter memorandum on Pitt's resignation, referred to in a later note.

fortnight or three weeks we had had two or three meetings. As you seemed from our last conversation to have no decided bias on your mind, and as I did not foresee the extent of the consequences to which within this week the question has led, I did not propose to you to come up at a time when I knew it to be inconvenient to you.<sup>1</sup> The result since was that, as far as our discussions went, the opinion of what would be a majority of the whole Cabinet seemed to be in favour of repealing the laws by which Catholics or Dissenters are excluded from office or Parliament, and making provisions instead, the nature of which parts of the enclosed correspondence will explain.

We were to have met again on this subject yesterday sennight, to settle how far any language should be held by the members of Government on the meeting of Parliament relative to this point, and to agree on opinions to be submitted to the King; but at the Levee that day previous to our meeting the King's language to more than one of his Ministers was so strong and unqualified on this subject as to show even then (what has since been more fully confirmed) that his mind was made up to go to any extremity rather than consent to the measure in question. Intimations to the same effect soon reached me from other quarters, and some in a way which left me no doubt of the industry already used on the question, or of the imprudent degree to which the King's name was committed on a question not yet even regularly submitted to him. Under these circumstances, with the opinion I had formed and after all that had passed, I had no option, and had nothing left but to consider how I could execute the resolution which became unavoidable, at a time and in a mode likely to produce as little embarrassment as possible. The enclosed will explain to you all that has since passed and the final result. I hope on considering them you will think that what I have done has been right towards the King, the public, and my own character. I hope also, if possible more anxiously, that you cannot feel yourself in the smallest degree implicated in my conduct, and that, being fortunately not committed to any opinion, you will be able to set an example of the

<sup>1</sup> This would indicate that 'the late' Lord Chatham attended Cabinets very irregularly.

conduct which I shall most earnestly recommend to every friend I have, of continuing in your situations and giving the most cordial aid to the Government which the King may form. I have long been persuaded that, whenever he might have occasion to do so, the Speaker would be the person to whom he would resort. It has proved so in the present instance, and I am most happy to find that the Speaker feels it his duty, in which I have most strongly and decidedly encouraged him, not to decline the task. I certainly need not add what my intentions are out of office, those of the most uniform and diligent support. I send this packet by a messenger, and must trouble you to return the papers to-morrow, as I have no other copies of them.

Ever, my dear brother, affectionately yours,

W. Pitt.

On the following day he also wrote to his old friend, Bishop Tomline :

Downing Street : Feb. 6, 1801.

My dear Bishop,—I have barely time to write to you two words on a subject which I fear will give you more pain than in many points of view it does me. But I trust in these times you can never be wholly unprepared even for any event which you may the least expect. A discussion has naturally taken place, in consequence of the Union, on the question of the Catholics, and it has very lately been brought to a point which will very soon render it impossible for me to remain in my present situation. The particulars I shall wish much to explain to you, and though I am not sure you will think my opinion on the question itself, I am persuaded you will see that with that opinion my resolution was unavoidable.

I have great comfort in feeling it to be so, and still more in the *firm persuasion* that an arrangement can be made to which I can give a cordial general support, and which may keep everything safe.

Ever affectionately yours,

WILLIAM Pitt.

Rose, I believe, will write to you, and very likely in a tone of despondency which I am sure the case does not call for.

Pitt must in resigning<sup>1</sup> have felt that he was bound by the strongest obligations of public duty and honour; otherwise, in the enormously critical position of affairs on the Continent, with his country involved in a terrible war, he should have remained at his post and proved himself to be the ‘Pilot that weathered the storm.’ Either of two courses was not unfairly open to Pitt, and he might have braced himself boldly to adopt either one or the other. He might have said: ‘This is a matter of principle and honour. I really encouraged this belief to pass the Union; I will stand to my guns; I will do all I can to induce the consent of the King, and if he chooses to take a more complaisant Minister I will still adhere to my attitude.’ Or he might have said: ‘The interests of the country are in such grave jeopardy from the terrible war now raging that I cannot abandon the helm for any question of domestic policy, no matter what my personal feelings and position may be; I must reluctantly yield to the King for the present about Catholic relief, but I will at all events pass the measure for tithe commutation and the payment of the Catholic and Dissenting clergy.’ He adopted neither course. He most reluctantly resigned. He showed no sustained purpose, or firm resolve. He proclaimed the strongest determination to support Addington, whose policy was to do nothing for Catholic relief. He encouraged his brother and many of his colleagues

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Tomline, in his memorandum of July 1802 on the resignation, says: ‘From his statement of the case I thought he did rightly in resigning; perhaps I was not a little disposed to his opinion from knowing that Mr. Pitt’s health had suffered materially from the fatigues of his situation, and I could not but hope it might be restored by leisure.’

to join the new Government. Sir George C. Lewis,<sup>1</sup> reviewing the position years after, said he was unable to justify or explain the course which Pitt pursued

This conduct of Pitt's was by no means approved by many of his friends. The action of his colleagues who consented to join Addington's Government was a good deal criticised. It is obvious from the following letter<sup>2</sup> of the celebrated and beautiful Georgiana Duchess of Devonshire<sup>3</sup> that pressure was put on several of them

<sup>1</sup> *The Administrations of Great Britain, 1783–1830*, pp. 209–212, by Sir G. C. Lewis: ‘In order to justify the step which he took, when he found that he was betrayed by some of his colleagues and that the consent of the King could not be obtained, two conditions were necessary. First, that he should be prepared consistently to act upon the policy of bringing the greatest amount of Parliamentary pressure to bear upon the King with a view of compelling him to re-admit a Pittish Ministry to office without any restrictions as to the Catholic Question. Secondly, that in the event of the King’s resistance being quietly overcome, he should be in a position which would enable him to use all the influence of Government for carrying this question, and to postpone all other considerations to its success. . . . We can understand two adequate motives for Pitt’s resignation —one, a deep conviction of the importance of his plan and a belief that by resigning he should promote its chance of success; the other, a point of honour that, having authorised Lord Cornwallis and Lord Castlereagh to obtain support for the Union from the Catholics by the promise of ulterior measures of relief, he was bound, if prevented by the King from fulfilling this promise, to retire from power. But neither of these reasons is consistent with his resigning his office in February because the King refused his consent to the measure of Catholic relief, and his signifying his readiness to resume office in March, although the King’s consent is still withheld.’

<sup>2</sup> *Pelham MSS.*, British Museum.

<sup>3</sup> In the *Dictionary of National Biography* the following description of the Duchess is attributed to Horace Walpole: ‘She effaces all, without being a beauty; but her youthful figure, flowing good nature, sense and lively modesty, and modest familiarity make her a phenomenon.’ She once asked Fox to write an impromptu charade, and when he asked for a subject she named herself. He at once wrote:

‘My first is myself in a very short word;

My second ’s a plaything; and you are my third.’

(*Idol.*)

by their friends to abstain. She was a popular, clever, and highly-gifted woman, who presided over one of the great political *salons* of the day.

Feb. 9, 1801.

My dear Mr. Pelham,—The very great regard I have for you makes me officiously and perhaps (?) write to you.

I arrived Saturday and saw my dear brother. I heard you had refused, but last night I heard they were pressing you to death, and before you have determined allow a faithful and sincere friend to say a few words. Do not betray me, for no one knows I write. Accept it as a proof of affection, and also believe that I shall be persuaded whatever you do you do for the best.

I own I shall be most truly sorry if you accept, not only in a public view but in a private one, and I am sure you will not be offended at my stating my reasons. The King's obstinacy and the impossibility of Mr. Pitt yielding is a most alarming circumstance for the country. Can you suppose it possible that Ireland will brook this disappointment? or that advantage will not be taken by Buonaparte? As for Mr. Pitt's idea of forming an Administration, whilst I admire his disinterestedness I condemn it, for he is canvassing in fact for a measure he considers himself to be full of every kind of danger, and what can he hope from an Administration that sets out with all the talents of Opposition on one side, and the talents of his Administration at best neutral? It would be fairer at once to let the King see the danger of his situation than to entice him into false hopes. My private reason is that no one but myself would perhaps dare to tell you the kind of contempt and scorn in which those who stay in are held, not only by opponents, but by all the friends of the old Government. You know how much I see of all sides, and you know, I am sure, by the liberty I am taking, which I think my duty to you, how much I value you.

Forgive this letter, and forget it if it is too late; but I own I think those who stay in are dupes to the King, or rather to the King's secret advisers—that they will do no good, that they will be the sacrifice and be shut out for ever from all the

other Administrations that may arise. You are too precious to act under so ridiculous a Chancellor of the Exchequer and First Lord. For God's sake forgive this! If you are determined, I shall endeavour to think better than I do of your new friends. If you are not, and I hope to persuade you, I shall feel secure that some day or other you will thank me. Let me see you soon, and do forgive the (?) and impudent zeal of this letter, my good friend.

G. DEVONSHIRE.

No wonder the King was pleased that in face of all obstacles Addington was able to form his Government. Bishop Tomline thus<sup>1</sup> describes his reception of Pitt at the Levee of February 11, 1801:

The Levee was remarkably full—but few or *none* of the *Opposition* were there. As soon as Mr. Pitt appeared, the King, then standing near the door, broke from the persons to whom he was speaking and moved towards him with the most eager graciousness imaginable. He then said, loud enough to be heard at some distance, ‘Mr. Pitt, I am glad to see you—I have a great deal to say to you—you have acted throughout this business like *yourself*, and *more* I cannot say.’ Mr. Pitt bowed with the greatest respect, and said, in a way endeavouring to stop the conversation, ‘Your Majesty has already said much more than the occasion required.’ ‘No, no; I must see you presently, I have a good deal to say to you. You have done everything you should do—so unlike your predecessors—I don’t care who hears me [upon Mr. Pitt’s evident wish to prevent his saying more]—I would have all the world hear me—I cannot say too much of your conduct.’ Mr. Pitt went afterwards to the King in his closet and stayed some time. The King expressed in the strongest terms his *perfect satisfaction*, his *extreme regret*, and his *affectionate attachment*. He was several times *much affected*—expressed an earnest hope that though this *unhappy circumstance*, in which both had acted from a *principle of duty*, had deprived him of Mr. Pitt as his *Minister*,

<sup>1</sup> Memorandum of the Bishop (*Prettyman MSS.*).

he might ever consider him *as his friend*, and that he should continue to see him often. And to this Mr. Pitt replied in the strongest terms of gratitude and attachment, but added, ‘If he did not appear before His Majesty as often as his love and affection would naturally lead him to do, he trusted His Majesty would attribute it to its true source—that of his zeal for the ease and satisfaction of His Majesty, as it seemed to him of the highest importance to His Majesty’s Government that it should appear to stand upon *its own bottom*.’

At first Pitt was apparently resolute in his convictions, and entertained the idea that he would never again come back to office without perfect freedom to carry them out. But he soon began to waver about any such pledge. The Bishop in writing to his wife on February 25, 1801, describes<sup>1</sup> a curious interview with Pitt on the subject : ‘We afterwards came to the important point of the Catholic Question, about which we talked a long time. He said that he had intended to pledge himself never to come into office without full permission to propose that measure, upon the ground of thinking that by so doing he should keep the Catholics of Ireland more quiet, from the hope that they might succeed in their wishes at some future time. I argued warmly and strongly upon this point, and Mr. Pitt owned that even what had now happened to the King in some sort shook his determination. I endeavoured to persuade him on public grounds that he ought to leave himself at liberty. . . . He would not absolutely promise not to pledge himself, but I am satisfied he will not.’ The Bishop was right, and it is manifest that even in the conversation Pitt was hesitating. There is a

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*

letter<sup>1</sup> of Rose to George III. in which he says, referring to Pitt and this subject, 'It affords me great satisfaction to be able to say to Your Majesty that in whatever situation, public or private, he may happen to be, he will not bring forward the question respecting the Catholics of Ireland, and that, if it should be agitated by others, he will supply a proposition for deferring the consideration of it.' It is unfortunate that the letter is undated. It is printed between two letters both dated February 6, 1801, but it could hardly have been written before Pitt's conversation with the Bishop.

Addington was a man of good ability,<sup>2</sup> of high personal character, and who had with distinction and success for many years filled the office of Speaker. He was a trusted friend of Pitt, who often consulted him on questions of importance; and when the King selected him to be the new Minister, Pitt gave to the selection the most cordial approval. There never was a man called to great office under circumstances of greater complexity and difficulty. History has hardly given him his due. It has been his hard lot to be always contrasted with Pitt, a Prime Minister of over seventeen years'

<sup>1</sup> *Diaries and Correspondence of Right Hon. George Rose*, i. 360. Rose was deeply attached to Pitt. His love for him was entirely disinterested. He contributed to the private fund for the payment of his debts, and insisted on resigning with him. Later on he refused to be Chancellor of the Exchequer.

<sup>2</sup> Dean Milman, however, the friend and defender of Addington, admits 'he was not up to the very high position he had attained' (*The Administrations of Great Britain*, p. 218, by Sir G. C. Lewis). Canning rather unfairly described him as one of the rulers who

‘Very little mean,  
But mean that little well.’

standing, with a great record and exceptional gifts. Judged by his words and actions, by the difficulties he had to face on the Continent and in England, in the House of Commons and out of it, with the occasional friendship, sometimes the precarious neutrality, and as often the real hostility of Pitt, Addington comes fairly well out of the ordeal. His letters are worthy and dignified. His motives were always honourable and upright, and he was ever animated by a sincere sense of duty and patriotism.

George III. had a short mental attack before the formal steps were taken for the change of office; and he remained incapacitated for over a fortnight—from about February 18 to March 6.

This caused much sympathy for the Throne, and Pitt, no doubt animated by this natural feeling, as well as by the Bishop's arguments, while the King was recovering conveyed<sup>1</sup> a message to him that during his life he would never seek to agitate again the Catholic Question. Pitt's friends became active in asking why, under these altered circumstances, should Pitt not stay on—why should he hand over the seals, still in his actual possession? Canning strongly held this view, and expressed it very plainly in a letter<sup>2</sup> to Pitt :

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*, memorandum relative to Pitt's resignation in February 1801 by Bishop Tomline : 'After H.M. was considerably recovered and before Mr. Pitt had resigned, Mr. Pitt met Dr. Willis at Mr. Addington's house, and, in the hearing of Mr. Addington, he desired Dr. T. Willis to assure H.M. that he would never bring forward the Catholic Question, whether in office or out of office, during his reign.' It would be interesting to know if Rose's letter to the King was written before or after this incident.

<sup>2</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*

[*Most private*]

Pay Office, Sunday night: March 8, 1801.

Although I had for many reasons determined not to obtrude upon you at this moment any suggestions of mine, and though I certainly have no reason to flatter myself that any advice which I might propose upon the subjects now depending is likely to have much weight with you, I do yet, after the most painful and anxious deliberation, feel myself impelled by a sense of what is due to our friendship to state to you my opinion as to the conduct which the public has a right to expect, and does expect from you, under the present circumstances.

Speaking from such an impulse, though I may do no good, I trust I shall not appear to you to stand in need of much apology.

Not to detain you therefore with any longer preface—I am thoroughly convinced that, under the present circumstances, you ought to offer to withdraw your resignation. That the offer, if made, will be gladly accepted, no man doubts: that it ought to be made, and will be made and accepted, is the persuasion of every man who wishes well to you and to the country. *For it* are all considerations of public honour and public interest: *against* it nothing but miserable, petty, personal considerations, which, so far as they relate to yourself, would be matter of surprise and regret, and of *as* loud expressed disapprobation as I believe the well-disposed part of the nation will ever permit themselves to use respecting almost any action of yours; and which, so far as any other persons may be suspected to be the objects or the abettors of them, will excite universal indignation and ridicule.

In substance I can figure to myself but two difficulties at which you can hesitate: The first, a point of honour, as the grounds on which you have given in your resignation; the second a point of delicacy towards your intended successor.

As to the first—you will not deny, what everybody else takes for granted, that the Catholic Question is disposed of for the present. What remains therefore is purely personal between yourself and the King. Surely you can feel it no point of honour to be sturdy, when the cause and the practical advantages of your sturdiness are, by your own confession, taken away. Surely there can be no humiliation in appearing to concede in

some measure to your Sovereign what at *all* events *must* be conceded ; and even if there were, surely towards such a Sovereign, in such a situation, a spirit less gentle and a mind less manly and less regulated than yours might humble itself so far without much struggle.

The other point relates to what you may suppose yourself to owe to your successor ; but in adjusting this to your own feelings and his (which ever might be) let me remind you that there is a third party which has a claim to have its interests taken into account—the public.

I will not enlarge upon this point, as I know you would consider my judgment upon it as not likely to be very impartial and unprejudiced : and perhaps I could not argue it throughout either so temperately or so gravely as you would like. But I trust, for the sake of the person in question, that *he* will not have left it to be argued ; that at the moment at which I am writing *he* will already have taken on his part such steps as must render all your scruples vain, and all arguments therefore from me or from anyone else wholly superfluous. Believing that he spoke the sentiments of his heart when he averred (*as in one instance I know he did aver*) that his first wish and object was that you should return to the situation which he held, as it were, in trust for you—it would be in the highest degree unjust and uncharitable if I were not to believe that *he* is the first man to hail the opportunity, which he must, in common with all mankind, see is now presented for the accomplishment of a wish in which all mankind joins with him.

I know no other consideration which could influence you, except it were the apprehension arising in your mind that you might be accused or suspected of clinging to office and so forth. I feel that I have some right to treat this sort of apprehension the more freely as it is precisely that which I had to overcome before I could resolve to speak my mind to you upon this subject. The scorn and shame with which I now look back upon such a difficulty standing in the way of the execution of such a duty is an assurance to my mind of the little weight which you will allow to any scruples of a similar nature, if they should present themselves to you as obstacles to the great duty which you are called upon to perform—*or* of the deep, though perhaps unavailing,

regret with which you will hereafter reflect upon your decision if (which God forbid) you should unfortunately allow them to have any weight in determining it.

I have but one word to add—what I have here written is written, I assure you upon my honour, in concert with no man, and with the knowledge of no man. That you may have received the like suggestions from other quarters I certainly have some reasons to believe. To them I am no party. I declare my own opinion and my own feelings. If by anything that may have been urged from other quarters you shall be induced to adopt the conduct which I would recommend, I shall not take to myself any share of the merit of having prevailed with you to do so ; but if, contrary to all our wishes and feelings and opinions, you shall unhappily persist in an opposite system, it will be, to the latest hour of my life, a satisfaction and comfort to me that I have not left undone what little was in my power to divert you from a resolution fatal, as I think, to your own credit and imminently hazardous to the safety of the country.

Most affectionately yours,

G. C.

Pitt no doubt felt perplexed and showed some infirmity of purpose. He loved power and was accustomed to it. Office and authority had become second nature to him. When he conveyed to the King that he would not agitate the Catholic Question again during the King's reign, he removed the strongest objection George III. might feel to seeing him again his Minister. Whether he was acting fairly to the Catholics, or consistently with his own action in resigning on the subject a few weeks before, is quite another question. Whether the pledge given to the King could be made to read entirely in unison with the statements made by Lord Cornwallis, at Pitt's suggestion, to quiet the Irish Catholics after his resignation, is also quite a different

matter. Pitt, however, would have been most pleased to resume office, but only if his conditions could have been satisfied—if the King and Addington had spontaneously taken the initiative in requesting him to do so. The project had to be abandoned, as Pitt would not stoop to any intimation of his views, and Addington would not make the first move. The following letter<sup>1</sup> of Dundas to Pelham states the position :

Clarges Street : March 11, 1801.

My dear Sir,—Our project may, and I have no doubt will, succeed some time hence, when some of our friends have measured their strength and discovered difficulties of which they are not at present aware. Before the King's illness I was very sanguine in my hopes of the new arrangement being so supported as to enable it to go on without much risk. Many things have recently occurred to shake me in that confidence. In short, the question has already totally changed its complexion, from the circumstances which are too well known to you to require detail. Awkward, however, as the circumstances are, we must do everything in our power to uphold the strength of Government in the hands of those with whom the King is to place it.

Mr. Pitt went from me last night to call on the Duke of Portland to prevent him from going to Mr. Addington. He re-stated in a conversation with me the grounds of doubt he formerly detailed, but at bottom the real reason is his perfect conviction that it could not be accomplished with the perfect goodwill of the successor intended, and that a spontaneous desire on his part, much beyond a bare acquiescence, was absolutely necessary to warrant him giving it even a consideration. This is the substance of what passed, and I am satisfied that all further attempts at present are vain. I therefore did not discourage him from going to the Duke of Portland. If he does at any time return, it will give him an additional inducement to

<sup>1</sup> *Pelham MSS.*, British Museum, v. 3107, p. 27.

do so that some of the (material) departments will, I trust, be found in hands wherein he may justly confide.

I remain, my dear Sir,

Yours sincerely,

HENRY DUNDAS.

It was hardly possible, or at all events not reasonable, to expect at that time an adjustment between Pitt and Addington, having regard to the then position of affairs. Addington had irrevocably changed his position; he had given up the Speakership; he had the greatness of being a Prime Minister thrust upon him by Pitt's own act and with Pitt's cordial approval.<sup>1</sup> Addington answered with dignity when approached on the subject. He would have been ready to consent to Pitt's resumption of power if it was desired by the King, but it was not for him to make the first move. So the resignation of Pitt and the accession of Addington were formally completed, and Pitt all through the early career of the new Government gave it a loyal support. Then he began seriously to doubt whether Addington's measures were for the interest of the country; and ultimately he formed the conviction that the sooner Addington was out of office, the better for the national welfare.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Tomline in his memorandum on the resignation, dated July 1802, says that Dundas drew up a scheme for a reconstituted Administration, with Pitt in his former situation and Addington as Secretary of State, but that Addington 'rejected it with indignation, and the scheme was dropped.'

<sup>2</sup> He resided much at Walmer during Addington's administration, and applied himself to drilling his corps to resist an invasion. What a glimpse of his life is given in a letter of Lady Hester's (November 19, 1803): 'There are generally three or four men staying in the house, and we dine eight or ten almost every other day. Military and naval characters are constantly *welcome* here; women are not, I suppose, because they do *not* form any part of our society. You may guess, then, what a

Pitt was absolutely sincere and honest throughout. His support was honest, his doubts were real, and his opposition represented his genuine convictions. When he opposed Addington, he believed in his heart that the interests and security of the country required a change; and having supreme confidence in himself, as he was well entitled from his record, he deemed it his duty to let the King know his views.

It is hard, according to our present notions, to understand exactly what occurred, or to sympathise with the methods adopted. Pitt was acting, proudly conscious of his own rectitude and public spirit, certainly not animated by a single sordid or unworthy thought; but, after reading all the narratives and all the letters of the period, an uncomfortable feeling suggests itself that

pretty fuss they make with me. . . . Mr. Pitt absolutely goes through the fatigue of a *drill sergeant*. It is parade after parade, at fifteen or twenty miles distant from each other. I often attend him, and it is quite as much (I can assure you) as I am equal to, although I am remarkably well just now. The hard riding I do not mind, but to remain almost *still* so many hours on horseback is an incomprehensible bore, and requires more patience than you can easily imagine. However, I suppose few regiments for the time were ever so forward, therefore the trouble is nothing. If Mr. Pitt does not overdo it and injure his health, every other consideration becomes trifling. The extreme care I take, or rather endeavour to take, of this blessing is rewarded by his *minding* me more than any other person, and allowing me to speak to him upon the subject of his health, which is always an unpleasant one, and one he particularly dislikes. . . . Mr. Pitt is determined to remain acting-colonel when his regiment is called into the field. I should not be in the least surprised any night to hear of the French attempting to land. Indeed, I expect it. But I feel equally certain that those who do succeed will neither proceed nor return' (Duchess of Cleveland's *Life and Letters of Lady Hester Stanhope*). In another letter, of slightly later date, from Walmer, in the same volume, Lady Hester has a most characteristic sentence: 'Alex. Hope has been staying with us. He is too perfect a creature. I cannot find one fault in his character but that of being too good. Such perfection is *awful!*'

Addington was not treated quite openly, or frankly, or fairly by all his own colleagues in these negotiations between Pitt and the King. Addington was Prime Minister, and Lord Eldon should have been very sure that he had the full concurrence and that he was acting with the full knowledge of his chief in all he did to bring the King and Pitt together to make a new arrangement. No doubt they were all honourable men—none of them consciously acting from a single indirect motive—but Addington was not at the time satisfied that he was treated altogether fairly by Eldon. He was a kind and forgiving man, but he could not help expressing dissatisfaction at the Chancellor having been the bearer of the letter from Pitt to the King containing expressions most injurious to the Government with which he was acting; and a calm reading of the correspondence<sup>1</sup> suggests that, considering Eldon was Addington's Chancellor,<sup>2</sup> he was rather active and alert to get Pitt back, and not very communicative to Addington as to the progress of events.

<sup>1</sup> *Secret Correspondence connected with Mr. Pitt's Return to Office in 1804*, edited by Lord Stanhope (Spottiswoode and Shaw, 1852).

<sup>2</sup> Lord Campbell, with characteristic candour about the motives of his predecessors, says: ‘Conscious that his plotting against Mr. Addington could not be concealed from the world, and that *prima facie* he was liable to the accusation of treachery, he was ever after indefatigable in repeating the assertion that he was “the King’s Chancellor” and not Mr. Addington’s . . . and he declared “with respect to the Chancellorship I was indebted for that office to the King himself, and not, as some supposed, to Mr. Addington, and as some of Mr. Addington’s friends supposed.”’ But if we give entire credit to these representations, they in no degree mitigate the censure due to his indirect proceedings; for the duties of his situation were the same, however he obtained it, and no degree of royal favour would entitle him to deceive a colleague who placed implicit confidence in his honour’ (*Lives of the Lord Chancellors*, v. 9, ch. 198).

The correspondence between Pitt and Lord Eldon was begun on March 20, 1804, by the latter. It is not suggested that Lord Eldon had then given any intimation to Addington of his intercourse with Pitt. It would appear from the letter<sup>1</sup> of Lord Grenville to the Marquis of Buckingham of April 19, 1804, that it was only on the preceding day that Addington had given any express sanction to the action of Lord Eldon, who had a good month before opened the correspondence to facilitate Pitt's resumption of office. His Administration, however, had been crumbling for some time. Addington plainly regarded Eldon as the natural and proper person to negotiate the 'new arrangement.' Villiers in writing to Pitt in April, 1804, says: 'I imagine that when you have seen Addington he will desire the Chancellor to speak to the King upon the subject. He has already prepared him for such a commission.'<sup>2</sup> There can be no doubt<sup>3</sup> that Addington felt Eldon had not been sufficiently frank or candid with him; and as far as the facts are at present known, there appears to have been some warrant for this view, but more as regards the form than the substance of the transaction.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Stanhope's *Life of Pitt*, iv. 151.

<sup>2</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*, T. Villiers to Pitt.

<sup>3</sup> Pellew's *Life of Lord Sidmouth* and Lord Colchester's *Diary*.

<sup>4</sup> Dean Milman says: 'I am not quite sure that Brougham is altogether wrong in his view of Eldon's conduct, though "intrigue" is a hard word. The fact I apprehend to be that the sagacious Eldon felt how near the house was to its fall' (see the *Administrations of Great Britain*, by Sir G. C. Lewis, p. 279). Lord Rosebery delicately conveys the same idea (p. 239): 'Eldon, with the prescience then inherent in the Woolsack, prepared for a change.' It is manifest that Lord Campbell was strongly against Eldon in his estimate of his conduct. The point he most presses is that Eldon himself in his own narratives does not refer to having had any correspondence with Pitt: 'I add Lord Eldon's own account of

No one has ever attempted to question the perfect openness and honour of Pitt's own action throughout. It is obvious, however, that Pitt deemed the occasion one which called for every exertion on his part to rally all his Parliamentary support against Addington. The following must have been one<sup>1</sup> of a series of letters written by Pitt to friends in the House of Commons :

[*Private*]

Walmer Castle : April 11, 1804.

My dear Sir,—I have had no opportunity lately of knowing what may be your sentiments with respect to public affairs, but, seeing that they are very likely very soon to lead to an important crisis, I am sure from our long habit of acting together, and from the many proofs I have received of your friendship and good opinion, you will readily excuse my troubling you with this confidential letter. You will have seen from what has passed in Parliament how much I have been dissatisfied for a considerable time with many parts of the conduct of Government, particularly in the essential article of what relates to the defence of the country. The experience of the last summer and the discussions of this session confirm me in the opinion that while the Government remains in its present shape and under its present leader nothing efficient can be expected either to originate with them or to be fairly adopted and effectually executed. With this persuasion, and thinking that a system of his part in the transaction as recorded in his autobiography entitled *The Anecdote Book*, showing with what caution this work is to be perused; for he would represent that the King was quite recovered when the change took place. He entirely suppresses his own previous intercourse with Mr. Pitt, as if the idea of the Minister's return had originated in a spontaneous order of the King requiring an immediate interview, and he would induce a belief that after Mr. Pitt was installed it became a matter of deliberation whether he himself should continue Chancellor, whereas all mankind must now believe that this was as well understood between them as that George III. should continue on the throne' (Lord Campbell's *Lives of the Lord Chancellors*, v. 9, ch. 198).

<sup>1</sup> This letter is in the possession of my old friend, Mr. Richard J. Greene, who has kindly permitted me to copy it.

more energy and decision is indispensable with a view both to the immediate crisis and the many difficulties we may have to encounter in the course of the present contest, I mean to take an early opportunity of avowing and acting on these sentiments more explicitly and decidedly than I have hitherto done ; and I shall endeavour to give effect to my opinion by the support of all the friends whom I can collect. My object will be to press to the utmost those points which I think essential to the public defence, and at the same time in doing so to make it, if I can, impossible for the present Government to maintain itself. In this object I have every reason to believe that I shall have the fullest concurrence of all those with whom I have the most differed on former occasions, and with whom possibly I may as little agree in future. With their numbers added to my own more immediate friends, and to the few who have acted with Lord Granville and Windham, I am persuaded that our division on any favourable question will probably be such as would be sufficient to shake a much stronger Government than the present ; and if a considerable strength shows itself in Parliament, I have no reason to suppose that any insuperable difficulties will arise in another quarter. Calculations of strength beforehand are necessarily uncertain, but I think at lowest our numbers cannot be much less than two hundred, and I should not be surprised if they were considerably more. I have thus taken the liberty of explaining to you very frankly my views and expectations. I do not feel that I have any claim to ask your concurrence and support, or to do more than to lay the subject fairly before you. If your own view of the subject coincides with mine it will certainly be highly gratifying to myself personally, and your weight and influence with your friends will, I have no doubt, in that case secure us a valuable accession of strength. I am, with great regard, my dear sir,

Faithfully and sincerely yours,

W. Pitt.

Pitt, through Lord Eldon, on May 2, submitted to the King his plan for a new strong and comprehensive Administration, including Fox, Grenville,

Windham, Spencer, and Grey. The King promptly objected to Fox, who behaved with magnanimity. He was quite ready to acquiesce, and left his friends entirely free to join Pitt even if he was excluded. Pitt did not insist on the retention of Fox in his list, and could make no real fight on the subject after his advance statements of intention. The King did not put forward any case of conscience now; his objections to Fox were purely personal; and if Pitt had persisted, it is quite possible that George III., as he did on Pitt's death, in January 1806, would have accepted Fox as a Minister. His rejection, however, led to very serious consequences, as Fox's friends refused to join an Administration from which he was excluded. Grenville wrote the following very plain letter<sup>1</sup> to Pitt:

Camelford House: May 8, 1804.

My dear Pitt,—I have already apprised you that all the persons to whom, at your desire, I communicated what passed between us yesterday, agree with me in the decided opinion that we ought not to engage in the administration which you are now employed in forming. . . .

No consideration of personal ease or comfort, no apprehension of responsibility, or reluctance to meet the real situation into which the country has been brought, have any weight in this decision. Nor are we fettered by any engagement on the subject, either expressed or implied. We rest our determination solely on our strong sense of the impropriety of our becoming parties to a system of government which is to be formed, at such a moment as the present, on a principle of exclusion. It is unnecessary to dwell on the mischiefs which have already resulted from placing the great offices of Government in weak and incapable hands. We see no hope of any effectual remedy for these mischiefs but by uniting in the public service 'as large a

<sup>1</sup> Buckingham's *Courts and Cabinets of George III.*, ii. 253.

proportion as possible of the weight, talents, and characters to be found in public men of all descriptions and without any exception.' This opinion I have had occasion to express to you in the same words, and we have for some time past been publicly acting in conformity to it. Nor can we, while we remain with this persuasion, concur in defeating an object for which the circumstances of the present moment afford at once so strong an inducement and so favourable an occasion. An opportunity now offers, such as this country has seldom seen, for giving to its Government in a moment of peculiar difficulty the full benefit of the services of all those who by the public voice and sentiment are judged most capable of contributing to its prosperity and safety. The wishes of the public on this subject are completely in unison with its interests; and the advantages which not this country alone, but all Europe and the whole civilised world, might derive from the establishment of such an Administration at such a crisis would probably have exceeded even the most sanguine expectations.

We are certainly not ignorant of the difficulties which might have obstructed the final accomplishment of such an object, however earnestly pursued. But when in the very first instance all trial of it is precluded, and when this denial is made the condition of all subsequent arrangements, we cannot but feel that there are no motives, of whatever description, which could justify our taking an active part in the establishment of a system so adverse to our deliberate and declared opinions.

Believe me ever, my dear Pitt,  
Most affectionately yours,  
GRENVILLE.

Much that Grenville wrote was true, but he was not the man to write it. Patriotism, public and private ties, his own previous words and actions, should have compelled Grenville to stand by Pitt. His desertion cut Pitt to the heart.

‘I will teach that proud man,’ he said, ‘that in the

service and in the confidence of the King I can do without him, though I think my health such that it may cost me my life.'

What should Pitt have done when he found that, owing to the King's action, he was unable to form the broad, strong, comprehensive Ministry that he thought the interests of the country then required? He had, it is true, hampered himself by a previous avowal that he would be willing to form a Government, even if the King 'resolved to exclude the friends of Mr. Fox and Lord Grenville.' But still the anxious question remains, What should a strong Prime Minister, thinking of all the circumstances that had to be taken into account, have done?

Pitt had shown what kind of Ministry he knew was needed. In his letter<sup>1</sup> of May 2, 1804, he had sketched with great power, for the King, the advantages of the 'comprehensive system' he deemed necessary, using weighty words: 'My opinion is founded on the strong conviction that the present critical situation of this country, connected with that of Europe in general and with the state of political parties at home, renders it more important and essential than perhaps at any other period that ever existed to endeavour to give the greatest possible strength and energy to His Majesty's Government by endeavouring to unite in his service as large a proportion as possible of the weight of talents and connections, drawn without exception from parties of all descriptions, and without reference to former differences and divisions.'

<sup>1</sup> Stanhope's *Life of Pitt*, vol. iv., app. iv.

He had argued with the King for Fox, been refused and submitted, being told he might have Grenville and his friends. He apparently thought it useless to press the King with the argument that without Fox he could not have Fox's friends, and that the alternative of a poor weak Ministry alone remained. If Pitt, indeed, had told the King that the interests of the country precluded the adoption of this alternative, sooner or later his terms would probably have been accepted. But this involved a contest with the King, and possibly much delay.

If Pitt's selfishness had been greater, or his patriotism less strong, he might possibly have refused to undertake the task of heading an Administration quite unequal to its vast duties. But his difficulties in refusing would be very great. The King's health was barely recovered and was still precarious. This made it well-nigh impossible for Pitt to put on an unstable brain the pressure of his commanding mind and masterful logic, to effect even a great patriotic object. His refusal or holding back might mean a relapse of the King, with possibly Regency debates in the midst of a crisis, or leaving the Government in hands discredited by public opinion. He was attached to the King, and he loved his country. He had to consider both. He could not turn back.

It is impossible not to entertain the deepest and profoundest sympathy for Pitt when, on May 10, 1804, knowing it might cost him his life, he felt bound to accept the Seals of office and to head his second feeble Cabinet.



Gainsborough Dupont, pinxit

Madison & Foutaliph, sc.

Right Hon. William Pitt.  
act. 30.



## CHAPTER XI

### BISHOP TOMLINE AND PITT—LAST DAYS

The Bishop—Lifelong friendship with Pitt—Private secretaries of Pitt—Twenty letters of Pitt to Bishop—Bishop takes name of Tomline—Bishop's letter to his wife on Pitt's criticism of his sermon—Her reply—Pitt wished to make Bishop Primate—His letter to King—King's reply—Result—Pitt's last illness—Bishop's 'memorandum on last hours of Pitt'—His paper 'Mr. Pitt's last days at Putney'—Pitt's death—Lady Hester Stanhope's letter three days after—Pitt's respect for religion—Canning—Wilberforce—Pitt's last words—His last speech—His kindly view of men's motives—Motion in Parliament for public funeral and monument—Opposition of Fox and his friends—Windham's conduct ungracious—Debate in House of Commons—Motions to pay Pitt's debts—Inscription on monument in Westminster Abbey—Estimate of Pitt's career.

ONE of Pitt's most intimate, most constant, and most trusted friends all through his life was Dr. Pretyman, afterwards better known as Bishop Tomline. Pretyman was a man of good family, of learning and information; a man of eminence at the University, a Senior Wrangler and a Fellow of the Royal Society, who from the time that Pitt went to Cambridge became his confidant and friend. He must have been a man of considerable force of character and attractiveness of disposition—full of sympathy, loyalty, and prudence—to have won and retained all through Pitt's life his warm and hearty regard. There never was the slightest breach or interruption in the affection which bound them to each

other. Pitt was never too busy to see Tomline, who for some time acted as his confidential secretary;<sup>1</sup> he was always glad to interchange views with him, and ever anxious to ascertain his opinion on the questions of the day.

Tomline must have been a true friend, and had the rare gift of infusing confidence and trust. A man who could so inspire Pitt was no ordinary man. Possibly his biography of Pitt has unduly lessened his reputation. It is true that the part he published was mainly composed of public materials of no special personal interest, but it should not be forgotten that he contemplated bringing out in a later volume the private, domestic, and family notices and information. It is probable he was prevented from completing his task by the reflection that the events were too recent to justify publication so soon after Pitt's death.

They saw one another so often that there was the less need for correspondence, as Pitt's house and table were always open to the Bishop. The following extracts<sup>2</sup> from the correspondence show how close was the confidence between them, and what reliance Pitt always placed on the Bishop's loyalty and sympathy :

Downing Street: Saturday Morning.

I am going to-day to dine at Lord Abercorn's. I shall be

<sup>1</sup> Pitt's private secretary during the principal part of his first Administration was 'Joe' Smith, as he was familiarly called. He was succeeded by Carthead. On Pitt's returning to office in 1804 William D. Adams became private secretary. In the account of Pitt's funeral in the *London Gazette* E. Marshall walked as private secretary, while Mr. Joseph Smith and Mr. Adams are named as Comptroller and Treasurer of the Household.

<sup>2</sup> *Prettyman MSS.*

here till half-past three, and shall return by twelve on Monday, and hope one way or the other to see you.

Yours affectionately,

W. P.

Wednesday, 2 p.m.

My dear Bishop,—I find there is a Cabinet dinner to-day, from which it is impossible for me to escape. There will be dinner for you here, if your conditional engagement with Rose does not hold. If I am not kept very late, we may probably meet in the evening.

Yours ever,

W. P.

Downing Street: November 4, 1787,  $\frac{1}{4}$  past 10.

My dear Bishop,—The Bishop of London died yesterday, in consequence of which I wrote last night to the King, recommending the Bishop of Chester to succeed. As soon as I have the King's answer, I will send to the Bishop. I am much embarrassed about a successor for Chester. This is a Cambridge turn. . . . Pray let me know what you think about it. On the subject of High Steward, I own to you I am rather indifferent, but perhaps it is a proper mark of attention to academical honours to appear to desire. If that is so, and if the success is pretty certain (of which I have not much doubt), I would certainly propose myself. Of course, the idea can only be mentioned in conversation at present; but before that is done, I wish you would be so good as to consult particularly any friends you think material. P. (?), for instance, and Farmer. It should also, out of attention, be mentioned to Turner. You will be so good as to decide for me, upon what you hear, and if your opinion is I should stand, let it be known immediately. . . . I have been much hurt on every account at the loss of the Duke of Rutland. He has given me a strong proof of his friendship and confidence in naming me one of the executors and guardians of his children. Lord Buckingham, you see, goes to Ireland; and Fitzherbert is his secretary. . . . I went yesterday to Hollwood to begin my summer, but was called back by some foolish business before night. I am going,

however, to make another trial, and mean to stay till Wednesday. Ryder moves our Address in the House of Commons. I am not quite without hopes that my brother may be brought to undertake it in the House of Lords. This, of course, is between ourselves. This long letter is partly the effect of a Sunday morning service and partly of the Chancellor being, as usual, an hour too late for an appointment.

I shall send it by a messenger, being impatient to know what you say to the first part of it.

Ever yours affectionately,

W. Pitt.

The effect of the termination of our French business seems everywhere just what one should wish.

Hollwood: Monday, March 24, 1788.

My dear Bishop,—I have been extremely concerned to learn the loss which you and Mrs. Pretyman have sustained, though, from the account you have before sent me, I apprehended it was but too probable. I should not break in upon you merely to say what, I trust, you will always be assured of—how much I share in your feelings in everything that can interest your happiness and hers. My object is to beg that you will let me know by a single line how both of you are, and how Mrs. Pretyman has supported the shock. I am here, recovering entirely the effect of our late fatigues, which have at length ended very prosperously, and will leave no bad effect of any kind behind them. Adieu.

Ever affectionately yours,

W. Pitt.

Cleveland Row: June 26, 2 P.M.

My dear Bishop,—I just this moment learn from Grenville that the Slave Question will come to a division on Friday next. I am very sorry to trouble you on so short a warning, but pray come *if you possibly can*. I fear Cambridge is out of the question.

Yours affectionately,

W. P.

Downing Street: May 27, 1791.

My dear Bishop,—I hear from many quarters likely to know that the Bishop of Durham is now in immediate danger, among the rest from Lord S., who expresses great anxiety to have Dr. V. placed on the Bench, and points very strongly at Lichfield (if the present Bishop should be removed) on account of its local convenience. Many difficulties strike me—its being a Cambridge turn; Lichfield being too good, to begin with; its interfering with arrangements which might vacate Beadon's livings; and, besides all the rest, a doubt whether Dr. V. is of consideration enough in the Church to make his promotion generally satisfactory. On the other hand, it is impossible for any man's claims to be stronger than those of Lord S. asking for so near a relation. The objection about Cambridge might perhaps be got over, as it will not be supposed that it will not have its equal share in the long-run while it depends on me, and there are certainly no personal claims from thence which are very pressing. Pray let me know what you think, as the event may happen soon. . . .

Best compliments to Mrs. Pretyman.

Ever yours,

W. Pitt.

I have just learnt that the Bishop of Durham is actually dead. As I could not get your answer by the post till Monday, I send this by a messenger, with orders not to interrupt you at an unseasonable hour. I shall lose no time in proposing to the King to offer Durham to Barrington, and, if he accepts, Salisbury to Cornwallis.

A letter of January 4, 1792, shows Pitt in the rare position of trying to grapple with domestic difficulties! The method he adopted was to postpone them!

I only found your letter on coming to town for the Leeve to-day, and have therefore not had time to hear Wood's story in all its detail, but I have had the outlines.

I think if (? Arcularius!) and Macfarlane confirm that part of it for which he refers to them, it will be sufficient to

satisfy me that I cannot keep my cook. My present impression is that there is an appearance of a sort of combination between the latter and Carter against Wood, and, if that is the case, I should neither think it fair towards him, nor prudent in point of example, to part with him at present, as I had intended. I incline, therefore, to think that if nothing arises to change my mind again, I shall change my plan, and fairly make the trial of another year, whether by submitting to be a little more *boar'd* than I like I can give Wood countenance enough to enable him to manage my family.

In this case I shall perhaps propose to him to take charge of the cellar. . . .

Downing Street: Sept. 19, 1792.

My dear Bishop,—I have settled that the Bishop of Exeter shall relinquish the Deanery of Canterbury and the Prebendary of Winchester,<sup>1</sup> and have desired Smith to talk with you as to the best use to be made of them.

I think you mentioned to me some time since that a son of Mr. Frere was very fit for some situation of business, and that his father wished it for him. You also once mentioned Maltby, of Pembroke, with a view to that line. I am not sure when it was, and perhaps he may have taken orders in the interval. There is now an office under Dundas to be disposed of, the business of which is to abstract and register a great deal of the correspondence in the Secretary of State's office, and the salary is about 200*l.* He wishes to have it well filled, and it occurred to me that one or other of these young men might do for it. . . . If these should be out of the question, can you tell me of anyone really worth bringing forward?

Ever affectionately yours,

W. Pitt.

Downing Street: June 19, 1798.

My dear Bishop,—Many thanks for your letter. I am certainly much recovered within this fortnight, and though I have had to-day some slight return of my complaint, I believe, upon

<sup>1</sup> This reference shows that at the time it was not at all unusual for a Bishop to be a pluralist. Several of the Bishops of that day held Deaneries.

the whole, I am much better in my general health than I have been during most of the session. But I feel still the effects, which you know but too well, of having been so long making exertions beyond my real strength ; and the knowing that I am not equal to doing all that at such a moment I wish is probably what most retards my progress. I teach myself, however, as much patience as I can, and I am persuaded I am going on in the right course. I shall be for some time principally at Hollwood, only coming to town occasionally to keep up the thread of business ; and even here I have many hours of leisure in the course of the day. Whenever, therefore, you can best spare the day or two you talk of, I shall be happy to see you.

Our accounts from the North of Ireland to-day are very good, many of the rebels having submitted after successes gained over them by General Nugent. We shall probably hear in a day or two the result of our principal attack upon Wexford. We are, I think, entitled to expect with little doubt that our fleet will have reached the Mediterranean in time to frustrate Buonaparte's expedition, whatever may be its destination, and if we are not very much out of luck, we are not unlikely to have had an opportunity of attacking him.

Ever yours affectionately,

W. Pitt.

With best compliments to Mrs. Pretyman.

Saturday, 40 m. past 2.

My dear Bishop,—My brother being to go to Windsor in the evening, I have promised him dinner on table here at half-past four o'clock. I hope that time will suit you as well as five, but if not I will keep some dinner for you. Elliot is rather better.

Yours ever,

W. P.

Burton Pynsent : Aug. 26, 1798.

My dear Bishop,—I agree with you entirely that I ought to take no part in the election of Dr. Waring's successor, and if you have no particular reason for the contrary, it seems best that you should be neuter also. You will be happy to hear

that I have found my mother extremely well. My niece is unluckily gone to Port Eliot. I shall watch with anxiety the issue of the storm which you think is to burst on the Turkish Empire. I wish the skirts of it may not reach India.

Ever affectionately yours,

W. P.

Downing Street: Oct. 24, 1798.

My dear Bishop,—. . . . My paper on the tithe plan is nearly completed. I will send it you as soon as it is ready, and shall be glad to know what you think of it before the Archbishop sees it. I am impatient that the measure should at least be correctly understood, though it may perhaps be advisable to delay bringing it forward till another session, or at least till after the 25th March, when the time allowed for those who have a preference in purchasing the land tax will expire. Farquhar's regimen (aided probably by our victories and the state of the revenue) has succeeded so well that he abandons all idea of Buxton, &c.; and if I go on as I am doing for another month, I have great hopes of being equal to all the busy scene that is approaching. I shall return the end of the week to Hollwood, where planting, &c., occupies me so much and agrees with me so well that I shall hardly be tempted to any more distant excursions before Parliament meets.

Ever yours affectionately,

W. Pitt.

Downing Street: May 26, 1799.

My dear Bishop,—I feel some reluctance in breaking in upon you, but there are such strong symptoms of mutiny on the subject of the Sierra Leone Bill, and it is become from collateral circumstances a subject of so much importance to the whole character both of the House of Lords and of Government, that I cannot help earnestly begging you, if possible, to be in town by Tuesday next. The business, I am afraid, will be such as to detain you for five or six days at least. You will probably find it most convenient to take your bed here. We have further accounts to-day of the progress of Suvarrow, which

are nearly decisive as to the deliverance of Italy, and everything promises well for that of all Europe at no distant period.

Ever affectionately yours,  
W. Pitt.

The next letter is undated, but it preserves the even tenor of intimate confidence :

My dear Bishop,—I have just read an account that the Dean of Durham died at Buxton last Thursday. I have written to the King, proposing to give it to the Bishop of Peterborough, which he will of course agree to. A decision must therefore be taken respecting Trinity College. Pray let me know what you think will be best. Preston seems out of the question, unless the Bishop of Peterborough keeps Trinity until there is some vacancy on the Bench. . . .

I am kept in town till next Wednesday at least, the King having been prevented by a swelled face from coming to the Levee at least. There is also to-morrow sennight another festival at Windsor, from which I know not whether I shall escape. At all events, however, I shall sooner or later make my second visit to Burton, and I think I shall find two or three days for Cambridge in November.

Ever yours,  
W. Pitt.

Downing Street: Friday, Jan. 24, 1800.

My dear Bishop,—You will see that the debate is fixed for Tuesday next in the House of Lords, and we should be glad if you can conveniently attend. In that case we might in the course of the week resume the ecclesiastical plan. I have a particular reason (which I will explain to you when we meet) for wishing to know as much as I can of the character of a Mr. Tikell, a young man now in the 15th Light Dragoons, who was educated at Harrow and was afterwards at St. Johns, which he left (I think) between one and two years ago. If you can learn anything from the latter quarter I should be much obliged to you.

Ever affectionately yours,  
W. P.

Wimbledon : Saturday.

My dear Bishop,—I have just received your letter, and should be much obliged to you if you will let the Dean of Peterborough know that I had from the first determined to recommend him in consequence of the present vacancy, and that the only reason of my not having written to him is the uncertainty what translations may take place, and consequently what see I shall ultimately have to propose to him. . . . The only application which I have had from the Bench is one to-day from the Bishop of St. David's. I rather think he might wait, and that I might recommend Sutton at once for Norwich. Pray let me know whether any better arrangement occurs to you. I am got perfectly well.

Ever yours,  
W. Pitt.

Walmer Castle : Sunday, Sept. 19, 1802.

My dear Bishop,—I am very happy to be able, instead of leaving it to my servant, to obey your orders, to answer your kind inquiry myself. Farquhar's account will have carried on my history as far as Friday, and will, I hope, have set you at ease about me. My progress ever since has been favourable, and as rapid as, after being so much reduced, I could possibly expect. My complaint has totally left me, my appetite and strength are returning, and I find myself able yesterday and to-day to take sauntering rides without fatigue, and to enjoy this return of summer. A very few days will, I am persuaded, restore me to all the health and strength which I have been able to boast of most of the time that I have been here. The only consequence of this attack, I believe, will be that it will induce Farquhar to resume the plan which he had laid aside of sending me to Bath, and though I should like much better to remain here till Parliament meets, I shall obey without hesitation. Remember me kindly to Mrs. Pretyman and to the boys.

Ever affectionately yours,  
W. Pitt.

Bromley Hall, April 16, 1803.

My dear Bishop,—I find it will save me a good deal of trouble to come to town for a few hours on Monday morning, and I shall therefore endeavour to see Smith and talk over the state of my private business before we come to you at dinner. As this is the case, you will, I am sure, have no objection to adding Rose to our party if he is disengaged, as I shall not easily find any other time during my stay in town to see him at any leisure. I shall have my carriage in town.

Ever affectionately yours,

W. P.

The Bishop was left a valuable property in Lincolnshire in 1803, and Pitt at once wrote warmly congratulating him :

York Place : June 28, 1803.

My dear Bishop,—I was unable to find five minutes yesterday to tell you (what, however, I trust you cannot want to be told) how much pleasure and satisfaction I felt from the unexpected intelligence which you have so kindly communicated to me.

So valuable an accession of property,<sup>1</sup> independent of its present convenience, secures permanent advantage to those most dear to you, which must afford you the highest possible gratification, and your friends will partake warmly in all your feelings on so interesting an event. I own I cannot help feeling a sort of respect for the memory of the person who has had the merit of judging so well on a slight personal acquaintance how he could make the best use of what he had to bestow.

You will probably hear from Rose, to whom I communicated the circumstance, and whose expressions of joy I believe to be perfectly sincere. Smith is out of town. I am likely still to

<sup>1</sup> The Bishop was already a man of means. He and his family had been in possession of property at Bacton in Suffolk for many centuries, and he had also acquired a considerable fortune with his wife. He now assumed the name of Tomline, by which for convenience he has been in advance referred to in these pages.

be detained in town a week or ten days longer by the discussions on finance and military defence, neither of which I think it right or creditable to fail attending. It is a little uncertain whether Farquhar will not afterwards advise me to go for a few weeks either to Bath or Tunbridge, which is as much time as I can spare from Walmer, where I very much wish to be at present, not merely for the sake of my farm, but for the duties which at such a moment as this belong to my official situation there. My coming to the commencement will, therefore, be out of the question. But I hope to find time for an excursion before summer ends. If you remain at Buckden I should not be without hopes of coming to you there and asking you to show me your new possessions at Riby; or if you have any thought of going to Lymington, I should like extremely to make a progress along the coast to meet you. I came to town a good deal unwell, and not very equal to the fatigue of anxious discussions in the House and (quite as much) out of it; but I have been gaining ground for the last three weeks, and am now very well able to encounter what little labour remains for the rest of the session. Lord Pelham is certainly the person to apply to respecting your change of name, unless the will specially requires an Act of Parliament for the purpose.

Ever affectionately yours,

W. P.

Downing Street: Dec. 17, 1804.

My dear Bishop,—Many thanks for your note. Lord Yarborough's answer is no great disappointment, as I had begun to doubt whether the inconveniences of being so very near town would not overbalance the advantages. It was only yesterday I learnt from Lord Castlereagh that attendance is much wanted at the India House on Thursday, and that your three votes would be important. I have not yet heard anything from the King in answer to my letter.

Everything promises well respecting the political arrangement with the person about whom we had so much conversation, and on much more reasonable terms than you expected.

Ever yours,

W. P.

The Bishop was greatly attached to his wife, who was a clever woman. Their correspondence, preserved at Orwell Park, is full of the deepest interest. The Bishop wrote to her freely on all subjects, and the following letter shows Pitt in quite a novel aspect—as the critic of a sermon, written for an occasion in which he was much interested, discussing it with its author most freely and brightly :

(1797)

Downing Street : Saturday Morning,  $\frac{1}{2}$  before 7.

My dearest Love,—I came hither last night between nine and ten, and was told that Mr. Pitt was at the Speaker's. I sat by myself in Mr. Pitt's room till the clock struck twelve, having eaten a good supper in the meantime ; I then rang the bell and ordered my bed to be warmed, and just as I was going out of the room Mr. Pitt's carriage stopped at the door, and of course I remained where I was. After 20 minutes' conversation I told him that I had brought my sermon in my pocket ; he said that he did not wish to keep me out of bed, but he was anxious to form some idea of it, that he would run over it in the hasty way he likes before he reads a thing in earnest. I assured him that I had no objection to sit by him. ‘Very well, but I shall not tell you whether I think it good, bad, or indifferent ; but we will have some other opportunity to discuss the point.’ Before he began I told him the plan of the sermon, and in particular that I had taken a higher tone in spirits than perhaps I actually felt, and that I had avoided party politics, and I thought he seemed to fear that it was not sufficiently directed to the time and occasion which arose from my statement. He began his first observation upon ‘He stilleth the raging of the sea and the madness of the people.’ ‘I remember,’ he said, ‘that there is another mention of that sentence in the Psalms, which is very fine and ought to be inserted.’ I recollect that it was ‘and the noise of the waves,’ to which he assented. (Am I right ? Look, and let me know what you think.) He then read on till he came to the same principles of W. J. and M. which gained the Jews, ever did, &c. &c. He

said that in these times, when the history of the Jews was thought so contemptuously and ludicrously of, that sentence ought to be qualified more, or more gradually expressed; but upon a little conversation, and upon my saying that upon such an occasion I must suppose that people would at least think seriously upon anything in the Bible, he gave up the point. He then read on till he came to the mutiny; of course I here told him that I had my doubts upon that passage. He was clear that the sentences about the army and mutiny must both be omitted, but that something should be said of the army in one short sentence, such as that our military exertions had been attended with great success, or that our army had distinguished themselves—he meant as fighters, not as to loyalty.<sup>1</sup> He then read on to the end without a word. On having finished, he expressed himself excessively (that was his word) pleased both with the plan of the sermon and the execution—some parts were beautiful and excellent—but he laughed when I again said, ‘You see, I have written in good spirits for the country.’ ‘Oh, I expected much more after what you said.’ I am confident he was satisfied upon that head. He then mentioned the passage about St. Paul as admirable, and told me fairly when I began that part. Says he, ‘I thought there was something very dull coming which would spoil what went before and was well put and animated, but I was exceedingly struck when I read on and saw how you applied it.’ He evidently considered that as the best part of the sermon—it is in his own way of thinking. ‘What do you think of the text?’ ‘Oh, very well, but I do not know whether some passage out of that story of St. Paul would not do better, and be more striking; for though your text does very well, there is nothing particularly appropriate to the sermon in it.’ ‘Perhaps it might—what do you think of “Except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved”?’ ‘Oh, excellent; it would so strike people of all sorts, and particularly when they come to see how you apply it. Then your sermon would be to prove that God, who governs the world by His providence, never

<sup>1</sup> The sermon was composed for some Thanksgiving Day, not easy to identify.

interposes for the preservation of men or nations without their own exertions.' . . . After a little pause he said: 'I really think that with that text it will be the best sermon ever preached.' I expressed myself strongly for this new text, and so we parted. He was in prodigious spirits after he had read the sermon, and I need not tell you that I went to bed with a joyful heart. Upon reflection, I continue to think that the new text would have a good effect; I see but one objection. People, from the text, might expect that I was going to prove that our Navy must be our preservation, whereas I turn it very differently; but, upon the whole, I do not think this a valid objection.<sup>1</sup> . . . I expect to hear from you upon this subject on Monday.

I had some little conversation about the Assessed Tax Bill. Mr. Pitt seemed to think that he could modify it so as to remove a great part of the bad impression against it. He thought that Fox's speech was very violent and Jacobinical, and had done him (Mr. Pitt) good.

On my way hither I called on the Admiralty, but could not see Lord Spencer. I saw my Lady, who was abundantly civil. Sir Joseph Barker, Mr. ( ? ), and another gentleman were there. I rather think the colours will be presented immediately before the 'Te Deum' or before the Communion Service. Mr. Pitt seems to favour the latter time. Lady Spencer is to go by water, and then come to the Deanery by the narrow streets. The King is to set out precisely at ten. The Archbishop called at the Deanery yesterday, but I was forced to make him wait at least an hour before I could see him. Everything right. I left my sermon with Mr. Pitt; he meant to read it again, and seemed anxious to see me about it; he was particularly desirous of my calling to-day, and said he would ride with me, if possible, to Fulham; he stays in town. But I mean to be at Fulham till Monday morning. I forgot to say that he thought I returned to prophecy unnecessarily after I left it. I do not remember that. He also said there were some words and, perhaps, one part which were too near invectives for a sermon. . . . Upon

<sup>1</sup> The Bishop, I believe, wrote some theological works; and several of his sermons in his own writing are still in existence at Orwell Park.

these subjects we are to talk. He meant to read the sermon while he dressed this morning. I begged him not to leave it about. ‘No, no. Depend upon it, nobody shall preach it but you or myself.’

Yours ever,  
G. L. (Lincoln.)

Mrs. Pretyman’s criticism<sup>1</sup> on the foregoing is worth reading :

(? 1797)

My dearest Husband,—. . . I have been more anxious for to-day’s post than I can express, not that I feared Mr. Pitt’s general opinion of it, but I thought he might find something to alter which would give you trouble and doubt and lessen your comfort in preaching it. I am made happy beyond expression by his having so soon given you such strong marks of his perfect approbation as to set your *mind* and *nerves* perfectly at ease, as I flatter myself they now are, and will be at the time of preaching. I enclose the two translations of the verse Mr. Pitt recollects, but I doubt whether ‘and the noise of his waves’ should be inserted; it adds an ‘*and*,’ which so placed has often a bad effect, and it seems to burden the sentence (of your sermon, I mean), and not to *agree* with those preceding and following, to which it is *applied*. On the other hand, the *third* number in the text prevents the sentences from running in *couples*. You will *decide*; I only state the *pro* and *con*, and really think it of little importance—perhaps you had better take it, *as being suggested by Mr. Pitt*. His suggestions have, as they ought, *very, very* great weight with me; but I cannot *implicitly* bend my *mind* (though I should my *vote*) to his judgment; I should have been greatly *shocked* if you had listened a moment to the objection respecting the history of the Jews. Is a Christian Bishop to *accommodate* his sermon to the *sceptical* or infidel spirit of the times?—upon a point, too, so important to the interests of religion as the *authority* of the Jewish history? I fear some

<sup>1</sup> *Pretyman MSS.* The long correspondence between the Bishop and his wife is full of interest and information; and refers very often to the topics of the day.

*impression* has been made on the mind of your friend by a certain person—but no more upon the subject now. The omission of the mutiny I quite approve, but how to introduce the *Army* in the way Mr. P. means I do not know, further than that the sentence must begin ‘Our Army,’ to agree with the rest of the *substantives*. I will try it before the post goes out—but what has the Army done upon the *Continent*? People in *general* judge of valour by *success*, and I should almost fear they would draw a *contrast* between the Army and Navy, though I know Mr. Pitt will not suppose this possible. I greatly rejoice that the *second* reading produced *more entire* approbation; but as you consult your *sincere* adviser, I cannot help owning myself *exceedingly* concerned that it confirmed his opinion about the change of text. You cannot, I think, doubt about the King’s liking your first far *better* than your second text—that is surely a *certainty*. It *seems to me also* certain that, considering the King as the sole proposer of this solemn act of devotion, *you ought*, as much as in you lies, to give *him* the honour of it in such times as these, and that the first text is far more proper for the day (as a Thanksgiving Day), whatever may be said of it for the *sermon*; but I wonder *much* that *you both* should like a ‘ship’ in the text of a sermon about *Naval* victories—especially when not applied to those victories—it looks like a *pun* or a *quibble* upon the word. Everybody will, as you say, expect it to be applied to our Navy, and the *different* turn you give it at the last will be a *surprise*; but is that sort of *surprise* proper for a *sermon*? The weight Mr. Pitt *gives* and is *desirous of giving* to *human exertion*, and his having been *so much struck* with that part of your sermon about the ship, makes *him* readily see a connection in the sermon with that text. But I will venture to say that not one of your *congregation* will or *can* see it till the *conclusion*, and then it refers *only* to *one* of the *points* you establish in support of your *general assertion of the Providence of God as the ground and cause of thanksgiving*. Mr. Pitt said, ‘Then your sermon would be to prove that God, who governs the world by His providence, never interposes for the preservation of men or nations without their own exertions.’ This, *as a Christian*, I am *bold* enough to assert against all the world *is*

*not true.* And God forbid you should ever be led inadvertently to *preach* and *publish* such an assertion, which leads to consequences which I have not time to state, and are surely utterly inconsistent with true religion ; with experience offered by every man's *heart*, if they will but *examine* it ; and with all history. For how often would the *blind* exertions of men conduct them to evil unless stopped by God, and how often does He save *men and nations* from 'evils which they can neither *foresee nor prevent*', and which they *cannot* therefore use any exertions to avoid ! But I will say no more upon this subject, except to beg you will remember that Mr. Pitt is a better politician than a *divine*, a better judge of *writing* than of *doctrine*. I think the Bishop of London will agree with me about the text. Perhaps Mr. P. will give it up, if you state my objections (not as mine, but as having *occurred* to *yourself*) as likely to strike *common* minds. It would be folly to say I think this matter unimportant, for I should not *then* have told you *now* that I do not agree with Mr. Pitt. . . . Surely it is a most extraordinary text for a day of *thanksgiving to God for past blessings*! *Preaching up exertion* is not your *avowed object*—you are to express your confidence and your *gratitude* towards God as the 'overruling Sovereign of the world and *Giver* of all good.' I should not like the 'ship' text for that sermon on any common occasion (*supposing* you could preach it on any other occasion), but I cannot bear it for a Thanksgiving Day. Had your friend's mind been more impressed with *due gratitude* to God, he would not have wished to take that text. . . . I shall be very anxious to know your determination upon this point. . . . Mr. Pitt saw *no objection* to the other text. . . . I do not see any one thing in the sermon that I *wish altered*. God bless you, my dearest husband. I shall write a *short letter*<sup>1</sup> to-morrow.

I am ever, most truly and tenderly yours,

ELIZA PRETYMAN.

<sup>1</sup> Mrs. Pretyman wrote very constantly to the Bishop when they were separated. His handwriting was rather illegible, and probably she did some writing and copying for him. He entertained the highest respect as well as the greatest affection for her. The Pitt family generally appear to have been on most friendly terms with the Bishop and his wife. Lord Chatham kept up a correspondence with the Bishop long after Pitt's death.

Pitt thought extremely highly of the Bishop's gifts and qualifications for the very highest Church preferment. He appointed him Bishop of Lincoln, and also Dean of St. Paul's. On the occasion of the vacancy in the Archbishopric of Canterbury (on the death of Dr. Moore), in January 1805, he was most anxious to appoint Tomline, and there can be no doubt that he put all the pressure he could on the King to secure his sanction.

The following letter to the King,<sup>1</sup> written before the vacancy actually occurred, shows how important Pitt thought it was to make the earliest possible application on behalf of his friend :

Mr. Pitt took the liberty of stating to your Majesty, when he had last the honour of attending your Majesty at Windsor, his anxious wish with a view to the expected vacancy of the Archbishopric to be allowed to recommend the Bishop of Lincoln as the fittest person to succeed to that most important station. As there continues to be great reason to suppose that the vacancy will speedily take place, he requests your Majesty's indulgence shortly to state the grounds on which that wish is founded. In doing so he hopes he shall not be misunderstood as wishing in the slightest degree to disparage the qualifications of the Bishop of Norwich, for whom he entertains a very high regard and a sincere friendship ; and whom he considers to be highly worthy of any mark of your Majesty's favour and approbation ; but he cannot, nevertheless, help feeling that the Bishop of Lincoln, having been a longer time on the Bench, has also during the whole of that period (now little less than twenty years) had charge of the

<sup>1</sup> *Pretyman MSS.* This is plainly the letter 'the rough copy' of which is referred to in Stanhope's *Life of Pitt*, iv. 234. The letter is in Pitt's handwriting, evidently the final draft copy of the letter sent to the King. There are a few trivial alterations, and the word 'uninterrupted' is substituted for 'intimate.' There is no date, but it is probably the end of December 1804.

most extensive and laborious diocese in the kingdom—that he has performed all his duties with a degree of diligence, zeal, temper, and discretion of which there are few examples; and, in addition to the performance of this weighty task, has devoted the remainder of his time to the constant and indefatigable pursuit of all the studies connected with sacred knowledge, and to the publication of tracts which are universally admitted to have rendered the most essential service to the interests of religion. In submitting this statement to your Majesty, Mr. Pitt is not conscious of having suffered any personal consideration to carry him further than will, he believes, be strictly supported by the concurrent opinion of persons to whose judgment your Majesty would be most inclined to give weight on an occasion of this nature. He hopes, however, that he may without impropriety request your Majesty's permission to urge as an additional motive for his anxiety the close and uninterrupted friendship which has subsisted between the Bishop of Lincoln and himself for above thirty years, and which has given him a personal and intimate knowledge of those qualities which justify him in the representation which he has presum'd to lay before your Majesty. He even flatters himself that, from the favourable and generous sentiments your Majesty has been pleased to manifest towards him, your Majesty would not be unwilling, in selecting a person for this high trust, to afford Mr. Pitt that mark of your Majesty's favour and confidence which has, he believes, been frequently extended to those in the situation in which your Majesty has placed him, and which, while it must be peculiarly gratifying to his feelings, may possibly not be unimportant to your Majesty's service at the present moment. He will only presume to add that, should your Majesty be pleased to accede to his earnest request, the Deanery of St. Paul's (which he understands to be now worth between three and four thousand pounds per annum) would, if your Majesty approves of it, furnish the means of placing the Bishop of Norwich in a very advantageous situation.

George III. was desirous of appointing the Bishop of Norwich, who was also Dean of Windsor (Manners

Sutton), and Pitt felt plainly aggrieved that his advice appeared to be slighted and his recommendation put aside, for his next letter<sup>1</sup> shows traces of annoyance:

Downing Street, Jan. 22, 1805.

It is with great reluctance that Mr. Pitt at any time reverts to any proposal which does not appear to meet your Majesty's wishes, but he considers it on every account his duty not to disguise from your Majesty how deeply his feelings are wounded and his hopes of contributing to your Majesty's service impaired by your Majesty's apparent disregard of his recommendation of the Bishop of Lincoln to succeed to the Archbishopric of Canterbury. He entreats your Majesty humbly to reflect that such a recommendation appears uniformly to have been graciously accepted *for a long course of time* in every instance but that of the nomination of the last Archbishop, which cannot itself be considered as an exception to the practice, because it took place in the interval between the resignation of one Administration and the appointment of another. Mr. Pitt has already had the honour of fully submitting to your Majesty the grounds on which he rests the Bishop of Lincoln's qualifications for this important situation. It is impossible for him not to feel that they are such as to afford no just ground for giving a preference to the Bishop of Norwich; and under the circumstances he must entreat your Majesty's permission to state that your Majesty's refusal to comply with his request can hardly be understood by himself, and will certainly not be understood by the public in any other light than as a decisive mark of your Majesty's not honouring him with that degree of confidence which his predecessors have enjoyed, and without which your Majesty must be sensible how impossible it is, especially at such a moment as the present, that he can conduct your Majesty's affairs with advantage. Mr. Pitt still flatters himself that when your Majesty is fully aware of these considerations, it cannot be your Majesty's intention to reduce him to so mortifying a condition. The sense of what he

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.* This appears to be the final revised draft, all in Pitt's writing, and showing several alterations and insertions of words and sentences.

feels due to your Majesty's service and to himself has made him anxious to submit this representation previous to his having the honour of attending your Majesty at the Queen's House to-morrow.

Pitt received in reply the following<sup>1</sup> polite but not very encouraging letter :

[*Private*]

Windsor Castle, Jan. 23, 1805.

The King is ever hurt when he cannot bring himself to concur with Mr. Pitt in any matter which Mr. Pitt seems to have at heart ; this he feels strongly on the present occasion, and has therefore continued silent on the vacancy of the Archbishopric of Canterbury ; indeed, it is but this morning that Lord Auckland is to deliver up the seal of the late possessor, therefore it would scarcely have been proper to have taken any step towards filling up the vacancy sooner. The King will certainly this day at the Queen's House hear whatever Mr. Pitt chooses to say on the subject ; but His Majesty by no means can view the Archbishopric in the light of a common Bishopric. It is the person on the bench on whom he must most depend, and of whose dignity of behaviour, good temper, as well as talents and learning he feels best satisfied : the Archbishop as well as the King are for life.

GEORGE R.

George III. held his ground and carried his point,<sup>2</sup> and, although Pitt was bitterly disappointed, he did not seek to make any estrangement on the subject. The Bishop took the matter quite calmly, and it appears

<sup>1</sup> *Prettyman MSS.* This letter appears to have been sent on at once to the Bishop, for it is in an envelope addressed : 'Private. To the Bishop of Lincoln. W. Pitt.'

<sup>2</sup> Lord Stanhope (iv. 252) : ' Its seems probable, I think, that the decisive struggle took place by word of mouth. Lord Sidmouth once said to Dean Milman that such strong language had hardly ever passed between a Sovereign and his Minister.'

from one of her letters that his wife had no desire for the change.

The Bishop never left Pitt during his last illness, and was present during all the sad closing scenes. Amongst his papers<sup>1</sup> is carefully preserved his ‘Memorandum on last hours of Pitt’ :

‘The Bishop, having been told by Sir W. Farquhar that he thought Mr. Pitt’s state precarious, went to his bedside and said “he found it to be his duty to inform him that his situation was considered as precarious, and desired his leave to read prayers with him, and to administer the Sacrament.” Mr. Pitt looked earnestly at the Bishop for a few moments, and then with the most perfect composure turned his head to Sir W. Farquhar, who stood on the other side of the bed, and said slowly, “How long do you think I have to live ?” Sir Walter Farquhar answered he could not say, adding something of hope that he might still recover. A sort of half-smile on Mr. Pitt’s countenance indicated that he considered this hope as merely a physician’s language, and calmly turning his head again toward the Bishop, he said in reply to the request he had made to pray with him, “I fear I have, like too many other men, neglected prayer too much to have any ground for hope that it can be efficacious on a death-bed, but ” (rising as he spoke, and clasping his hands with the utmost fervour and devotion) “I throw myself entirely ” (with strong emphasis) “upon the mercy of God *through the merits of Christ.*”

<sup>1</sup> *Pretyman MSS.* The Bishop communicated the substance of this memorandum to Gifford, who referred to it in his *Life of Pitt.*

‘The Bishop assured him the frame of his mind at this awful moment was exactly such as might be expected to render prayer acceptable and useful; from which, after some conversation, Mr. Pitt assented to hear prayers read to him, and joined in them with calm and humble piety. Mr. Pitt repeatedly expressed in the strongest manner his sense of his own unworthiness to appear in the presence of God, disclaiming all ideas of merit, but without appearing to have any weight upon his conscience. He appealed to the Bishop’s knowledge of the steadiness<sup>1</sup> of his religious principles, and said it had ever been his wish to act rightly and to fulfil his duty to God in the world; but that he was very sensible of many errors and failures. He declared himself perfectly resigned to the will of God, that he felt no enmity towards anyone, but died in peace with all mankind, and expressed his hope, at once humble and confident, of eternal happiness, through the intercession of his Redeemer. While the Bishop was kneeling at Mr. Pitt’s bedside, unable entirely to restrain his feelings, after having read prayers, Mr. Pitt took hold of his hand and in *his own most* affectionate manner said: “I cannot sufficiently thank you for all your kindness to me throughout life.” What a trait of character was this! What an unspeakable comfort to his friend in the agonising hour of separation! Mr. Pitt mentioned no other person’ (added by the Bishop in different ink, and apparently at a later date), ‘nor did he send any message to anyone.’

<sup>1</sup> Rose, recording a conversation with the Bishop a few weeks after the death, says that Pitt referred to ‘the innocence of his life’ (*Rose’s Diary*).

There is also another paper in the Bishop's writing endorsed 'Mr. Pitt's last days at Putney':

'When the Bishop of Lincoln asked Mr. Pitt whom he wished to settle his affairs and papers, he replied "My brother" (in a tone as if that was a matter of course), but added immediately, "but not my brother only—I wish you to be joined with him." About nine o'clock Mr. Pitt said, "I wish a thousand or fifteen hundred a year to be given to my niece, if the public should think my long services deserving of it, but I do not presume to think I have earned it." He then spoke of the Stanhopes (Lady Hester and Mr. Stanhope were in his house), remarking that they would be "left destitute;" but, correcting himself, he added, "I ought not to say destitute, as their father is living."

'Upon the Bishop desiring Mr. Pitt to give what directions he thought fit respecting his papers or any other subject, Mr. Pitt called for pen and ink, but was unable to write legibly. Mr. Pitt then dictated, and the Bishop wrote from his lips. Mr. Pitt afterwards read what was written, and signed the several papers in the presence of Sir Walter Farquhar and several servants who were also present a part of the time, while Mr. Pitt was engaged in religious duties, and heard this greatest and best of men in talents and in heart profess the faith and hope and charity of an humbly pious Christian. Mr. Pitt was exceedingly fatigued by these exertions, and when the Bishop again proposed to administer the Sacrament, he desired to rest a little. The Bishop did not press it further that moment, as the opinion of Sir W. Farquhar that Mr. Pitt would

probably continue in the same state much longer than he actually did, and especially the perfect state of his faculties and composed yet animated manner during the whole of this most memorable scene induced him to expect an opportunity would remain perhaps better suited to the performance of that duty. But Mr. Pitt very soon grew much worse; about two o'clock he seemed to suffer for some time and struggled for breath, but with the most perfect patience. He then fell into a sort of stupor, but was occasionally sensible almost to the last. About a quarter-past four on Thursday morning, January 23, 1806, his soul departed in a gentle sigh.'

Pitt died on the anniversary of the day on which twenty-five years before he had first entered the House of Commons.

Lady Hester Stanhope, writing<sup>1</sup> three days after, says: ' You have no idea of the consolation it is to me that I received the last blessing of that beloved angel; and that when forbid to see him (because it was thought he would not know me) I took my own way and disobeyed unnatural commands. My voice recalled his scattered senses, and he was perfectly collected the whole time I was with him; and when I departed, and though his ideas again became confused, he continued to name me with affection. This proved pre-eminence over the rest of the world will compensate me for many future sorrows which his loss must entail upon us.'

Pitt must have entertained much respect for religion,

<sup>1</sup> Letter to Mr. Adams, January 26, 1806 (Duchess of Cleveland's *Life and Letters of Lady Hester Stanhope*).

even if he was not a religious man. This was plainly the view of his most brilliant disciple, for Canning in his sketch<sup>1</sup> of Pitt, written immediately after his death, says: ‘Absorbed as he was in the pursuits of public life, he did not neglect to prepare himself in silence for that higher destination which is at once the incentive and reward of human virtue. His talents and superiority, splendid as they were, never made him forgetful of that eternal wisdom from which they emanated. The faith and fortitude of his last moments were exemplary.’

Wilberforce<sup>2</sup> wrote sadly: ‘I have a thousand times (ay, times without number) wished and hoped that a final interval would be afforded him, perhaps in the evening of life, in which he and I might confer freely on the most important of all subjects. But the scene is closed—for ever.’ He adds pathetically: ‘Poor Pitt, I almost believe, died of—a broken heart! For it is only due to him to declare that the love of his country<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Canning and His Times*, p. 81.

<sup>2</sup> Wilberforce, *Life*, iii. 245–51. Pitt’s letter to Wilberforce on the conversion and change of life of the latter is most interesting and full of feeling (*Private Papers of Wilberforce*, 1897). Lord Wellesley, in his letter on Pitt of November 22, 1836, says: ‘In truth he was not merely a faithful and dutiful, but a learned member of our Established Church.’

<sup>3</sup> Pitt’s last words were: ‘Oh, my country. How I leave my country!’ (Stanhope’s *Life of Pitt*, iv. 378). These are the words recorded by the Hon. J. H. Stanhope, who was present. Rose, however, in the debate in the House of Commons on the motion for funeral honours to Pitt, names fewer words: ‘It was well known to those who were in the room when that great man expired that the last words he uttered were, “Oh, my country!”’ Rose spoke on January 27, the fourth day after Pitt’s death. The Bishop, it may be noted, does not refer to the words. (See Cobbett’s *Parliamentary Debates*, vi. 59.) Pitt’s last speech in public was at the Lord Mayor’s annual banquet in November 1805. It is very short, very complete, and very dignified. His health was proposed as ‘the saviour of Europe,’ and his reply was contained in these simple words: ‘I

burned in him with as ardent a flame as ever warmed the human bosom, and the accounts from the armies struck a death-blow within.'

Wilberforce was Pitt's closest, warmest, and most respected friend—no blind follower ; a man who thought for himself; who voted against Pitt on a great personal occasion, as his own sense of public duty led him—and his estimate of Pitt may be taken as that of a very honest and very capable judge : ‘For personal purity, disinterestedness, integrity, and love of his country I have never known his equal.’

No bitterness existed in Pitt’s nature, and, notwithstanding the trials and experiences of life, he always inclined to take a kindly view where he could of the motives of men. Lord Eldon records :<sup>1</sup> ‘Not long before his death I asked Mr. Pitt whether his intercourse with men upon the whole led him to think that the greater part of them were governed by reasonably honourable principles or by corrupt motives. His answer was that he had a favourable opinion of mankind upon the whole, and that he believed the majority was really actuated by fair meaning and intention.’

On Pitt’s death it was at once felt that Parliament should give effect to the national feeling and commemorate the name of the great Minister, and that it would be fitting to adopt the very words used by a former Parliament on the occasion of the death of his illustrious father. Accordingly on August 27, 1806, Mr. Henry

return you many thanks for the honour you have done me. But Europe is not to be saved by any single man. England has saved herself by her exertions, and will, as I trust, save Europe by her example.’

<sup>1</sup> *Anecdote Book*, i. 499 ; *Twiss’s Life*.

Lascelles<sup>1</sup> moved, and the Marquis of Titchfield seconded, that ‘An humble address be presented to His Majesty, that His Majesty will be graciously pleased to give directions that the remains of the Right Honourable William Pitt be interred at the public charge, and that a monument be erected in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, to the memory of that excellent statesman with an inscription expressive of the public sense of so great and irreparable a loss; and to assure His Majesty that this House will make good the expenses attending the same.’ The motion was supported, as appears from the ‘Parliamentary Debates,’ by Lord Lovaine, Mr. J. H. Browne, Mr. Hiley Addington, Sir R. Buxton, General Tarleton, Earl Temple, Mr. R. Ryder, Mr. Rose, Lord Castlereagh, Mr. Wilberforce, and Sir Robert Williams; and opposed by Lord Folkestone, Mr. W. Smith, the Marquis of Douglas, Mr. Windham, Mr. George Ponsonby, and Mr. Fox. The debate was not unworthy of the occasion. The mover and seconder spoke shortly, moderately, and with dignity, and those who concurred in the motion did not indulge in any extravagant language. Windham, who had been for years a colleague of Pitt and sat with him in the same Cabinet, might well have abstained from the discussion, if unable to support the proposition; but nothing could have been more lofty, dignified, and worthy than the language of Fox, when he gave his reasons, full of respect and regret, explaining that his public duty called upon him ‘in the most imperious and irresistible manner’ to oppose the motion, and that,

<sup>1</sup> Cobbett’s *Parliamentary Debates*, vi. 42.

however painful to his feelings in every respect, he must do his duty. The portion of the motion to which Fox and his friends took special exception was that which referred to Pitt as an ‘excellent statesman.’<sup>1</sup> His task was difficult, but he succeeded in making his position perfectly clear, in simple and manly words. He said: ‘I do not know, sir, that ever I rose to address the House in the performance of my public duty with more pain than I do at this moment. . . . For many of the supporters of the present motion I have a personal friendship, which would make me reluctant to oppose them on such an occasion; but most of all would it be my interest, as well as my inclination, not to cross in this instance the views of the noble Lord near me (Lord Temple) and other near relations of the deceased Minister, with whom I am now likely to be for the remainder of my life inseparably connected. The vote, therefore, may be considered as one not given to gratify any feeling of private animosity, but extorted by a most painful but imperious duty. . . . I, sir, have been engaged in a long course of opposition to the person for whom public honours are now claimed; I may say that I have been considered, and perhaps it

<sup>1</sup> Fox and Sheridan were ready to agree to a form of words. Instead of styling him ‘an excellent statesman’ and his loss as ‘irreparable,’ they were prepared to concur in words expressive of his ‘transcendent talents and virtues and the disinterested integrity displayed throughout a long course of arduous services.’ But the proposal fell to the ground, as Windham refused to agree (Lord Colchester’s *Diary*, ii. 31). In the recent case of Mr. Gladstone both Houses of Parliament, *nemine contradicente*, voted a public funeral and a monument in Westminster Abbey ‘with an inscription expressive of the public admiration and attachment, and of the high sense entertained of his rare and splendid gifts, his devoted labours in Parliament and in great offices of State.’ Windham’s refusal to agree was most ungracious, and it is not easy to understand his action.

may be called an honour, as his rival. But I do assure the right honourable gentleman and his most zealous admirers that during all that time I never opposed him from a personal motive in my life. . . . Great qualities he certainly had in no ordinary degree, in private life, and great qualities also in points connected with his administration. . . . No Minister was ever more disinterested, as far as relates to pecuniary matters. . . . I therefore, sir, have every reason from my intimate friendship and near connection with the living, and from my own private feelings and respect for the dead, who undoubtedly possessed many estimable qualities, to give my support to the motion now before the House. I might be lead to this by another motive. If personal vanity had any weight with me, I might from this consideration concur with the honourable gentleman. I might by this means gain a great deal of applause, without any loss whatever in a party point of view ; and I do not pretend to be insensible to praise, any more than others. But there are cases, sir, in which our public duty is so clear and imperious that no desire of praise, no motive of personal respect, no wish to gratify our friends, nor any other consideration, however powerful, can possibly enable us to dispense with it, and in my conscience, sir, I believe this to be one of those cases. If the marks of respect were such as did not compromise my public duty in the compliance, no person would join in it more cheerfully and more eagerly than I would.' Lord Castlereagh, who spoke after Fox, acknowledged that those who had opposed the motion 'had throughout performed what they believed

to be their duty, in a manner that redounded highly to their credit.' The motion was carried by 258 to 89. A few days later a motion to advance 40,000*l.* for the payment of Pitt's debts was voted by the House of Commons, *nemine contradicente*, Fox warmly declaring that he had never given a vote with more satisfaction in his life.

Pitt was buried in Westminster Abbey, 'the Temple of Silence and Reconciliation,' and the inscription on his monument<sup>1</sup> is simple and sufficient :

THIS MONUMENT  
IS ERECTED BY PARLIAMENT TO  
WILLIAM PITT,  
SON OF WILLIAM, EARL OF CHATHAM,  
IN TESTIMONY OF GRATITUDE  
FOR THE EMINENT PUBLIC SERVICES  
AND OF REGRET FOR THE IRREPARABLE LOSS  
OF THAT GREAT AND DISINTERESTED MINISTER.  
HE DIED ON JANUARY 23, 1806, IN THE 47TH YEAR OF HIS AGE.

In order to form a sound estimate of Pitt's career, it must be taken as a whole and judged in its entirety. It is practically impossible to make quite separate divisions of his public life, although it broadly partitions itself into three periods :—First, from the time he first took office until 1792–93; second, from the last-mentioned date until after the Union ; and third, from thence until the end.

He had the genius of command, and was one of the

<sup>1</sup> Pitt was buried in his father's grave. His monument is situated a long way off, over the west door—a most unfortunate position, where it impresses nobody, and where the inscription can be read with difficulty.

greatest Parliamentary leaders England has ever seen ; but it may be questioned if his public efficiency would not have been enhanced, had he possessed some of that ‘ subordinate ’ experience he so haughtily repudiated, and had his long public life been more tempered by some of the teachings of Opposition. He came to regard rule and office almost as his right. He retired with reluctance in 1801, and he was anxious for restoration in 1804—but from no small or unworthy motives, honestly believing the country had need of him. He enjoyed many great advantages, and had to face many great difficulties—very unequally divided through his career. His difficulties were greatest when his advantages were least.

Almost all writers have combined to praise his conduct during the first period. He was a great peace Minister—anxious for reform, for purity of administration, for economy, and the fostering of commerce.

The second period is that marked by the development of the French Revolution and the Irish Union. Pitt remained at peace as long as he could, but he naturally was profoundly impressed by the progress of the French Revolution, and by the strong feeling prevailing around him of real panic at its development, of immense dread lest its teachings and its ‘ mighty and furious ’ spirit should spread and subvert the old order of things throughout Europe. Pitt must be judged, not by the tranquil philosophy of a century after the events, but by the light of ‘ the living present ’ in which he lived, by the reasoning and forebodings which induced Burke, Spencer, Windham, and Portland to separate from Fox,

leaving him almost alone with Grey and Sheridan. Pitt's task was vast—to protect the Empire and to check the ascendancy of Napoleon and 'the French system of aggrandisement and aggression,' which appeared to threaten the independence of every country in Europe. He was not unequal to the occasion.<sup>1</sup> He met it as best he could by efforts at home—keeping up the Navy, strengthening the Army—by combinations and subsidies abroad, by never quailing before disaster, and by steadily sustaining the courage of the nation by his own dauntless words and his own indomitable spirit. With these vast cares he had also to consider domestic affairs, and his great scheme of policy in reference to Ireland was one worthy of a great statesman.<sup>2</sup>

The third period is that on which history will have most difficulty in framing its impartial judgment. There was one great shortcoming and one great misfortune. Pitt's conduct after the Union in reference to the Irish Catholic claims and Tithe Relief was not marked by that resolution and intrepidity that his own previous action and language required. Being forced to undertake the administration in 1804 with such a lame and weak Cabinet was a serious misfortune. The needs of

<sup>1</sup> Mahan, in his *Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire*, has vigorously asserted the success of Pitt's war policy as that of 'the master spirit who directed the movements of the British nation.' He points out (ii. 394): 'It is a singular fact that neither the extraordinary commercial prosperity secured by his successes, nor the immense development of the Navy during Pitt's Administration, is mentioned in the celebrated denunciation of his "drivelling" war policy by Macaulay.'

<sup>2</sup> 'Pitt was the first English Minister who formed great designs for the benefit of Ireland' (Macaulay).

the country should have induced ‘that proud man’—Grenville—and his other friends to follow Fox’s magnanimous advice and join the new Government, regardless of his ostracism. But when Pitt yielded to the King’s objection to Fox, and found that Fox’s friends would not condone his exclusion, he was forced by events to abandon that scheme of a broad Administration, combining the greatest obtainable power, which he honestly thought would be best for the interests of the country. His second Administration was so little stronger than Addington’s that he actually had soon to make it less feeble by the addition of Addington himself.

Pitt’s excuses are to be sought for in the King’s condition, the state of his own health, and the action of his colleagues. George III. had a mental attack in 1801 and another, more prolonged and serious, in the spring of 1804—two most critical occasions. Even when convalescent, the King’s obstinacy of disposition complicated matters. Pitt had to deal with a Sovereign entitled to special consideration owing to his health, and who, whilst claiming and getting that consideration, put forth all his resistance to what he objected. Pitt’s own health also at this period required close and anxious care. Although he retained all his courage and all his marvellous powers of speech and administration, his general health was getting steadily undermined, and he probably often found it difficult to bring to bear on the great emergencies with which he had to deal the same resource and determination which had marked earlier times.

It must, in considering his difficulties, always be remembered that on the Catholic Question his Cabinet was divided, and that the weakness of his second Administration was largely due to the desertion of Grenville.

The life of this great statesman must be judged after taking into account, not only his actions and his motives, but also the times in which he lived, with all their difficulties and all their emergencies. In its review his ‘personal purity, disinterestedness, integrity, and love of country’<sup>1</sup> stand out conspicuous. His aims, his gifts, and his powers were great, and William Pitt must for ever be regarded as a very noble figure in the public life of England.

<sup>1</sup> Wilberforce. Pitt himself said that the quality most required by a Prime Minister was ‘patience.’

## APPENDIX

---

*Abridgment from the Catalogue in the possession of the Hon. Mrs. Edward Stanhope of all known Portraits, Busts, Engravings from Portraits, &c., of William Pitt, by George Scharf, C.B., F.S.A., Director of the National Portrait Gallery, 1886.*

---

N.B.—The initials 'E. S.' indicate that the engraving is in the Collection made by the Right Hon. Edward Stanhope, M.P.

---

1779. AGED 20.

1. *Original Drawing by J. S. Copley, R.A.*

At Chevening. To the waist, wearing the gown of a gentleman commoner over an ordinary coat with dark buttons, a white neck-cloth and full frill to shirt-front. His white powdered hair hangs long behind.

A study for the following picture.

[Engraved in 1789 by Bartolozzi, and in 1861 by William Holl.]

1780. AGED 21.

2. *Original Picture of the Death of Chatham by Copley.*

In the National Gallery, to which it was presented by Lord Liverpool in 1828: a well-known composition. The figure of William, standing behind his two brothers with both hands raised, is very conspicuous.

[The picture was engraved on a large scale in line by Bartolozzi in 1792, and small by F. Walker, for Jones's 'National Gallery.' A smaller reproduction of Bartolozzi's engraving was by Delatre in 1820.]

1781. AGED 21-22.

3. *Engraving of the Death of Chatham in line by J. K. Sherwin.* (Probable date.)

4. *Engraving by Walker* (September 1781, 8vo.). (E. S.)

'Hon. Wm. Pitt, Esqr.'

The face seen in three-quarters to the left, the eyes looking at the spectator; wearing a white cravat and shirt-frill; a black tie to his hair is partly visible.

1782. AGED 23.

5. *Engraving from the 'London Magazine' for December 1782* (8vo. size). (E. S.)

'Rt. Hon. Wm. Pitt, Esqre., Chancellor of the Exchequer.' In a round frame, wearing a plain coat and white tie.

6. *Vignette head drawn by J. Sayer.* (Probable date.) (E. S.)

A small profile, turned to the right, with long uncurled hair.

In the possession of T. Turner, Esq. Lithographed by R. J. Lane.

[In this year appeared also the earliest known caricature of Mr. Pitt, executed by the Marquess Townshend.]

1783. AGED 24.

7. *Original Portrait by G. Romney.*

At Bayham Abbey. A bust only; wearing a plain blue coat and yellow buttons; no turn-over collar, and no indication of the Chancellor's robe.

In Romney's Life by his son, p. 194, we learn that in this year he painted Lord Chatham and Mr. Pitt. The former is now at Chevening; the latter remained for many years in his studio with the head alone finished. Mr. Romney received 50*l.* for it from Mr. Pitt's tutor, the Rev. E. Wilson.

[A mezzotint from this head, with the figure extended to half-length, was executed by J. Jones, 1789.]

8. *Engraving in an oval, with no border (in colours),*  
8vo. size. (E. S.)

Engraved in stipple and printed in various colours. Wearing a blue buttoned coat. The nose is aquiline. The hair is powdered and curled over the ear, with a black tie behind.

'Published by E. Hodges, No. 2 Cornhill, July 1783.'

9. *Medallion by Hancock.*

'William Pitt appointed First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, December 1783.'

1784. AGED 25.

10. *Engraving in the 'European Magazine' for January 1784.*  
(E. S.)

1785. AGED 26.

11. *Large Etching by J. Sayer.* (E. S.)

'Cicero in Catilinam. Published 17 March, 1785, by Thos. Cornell, Bruton Street.' Signed to the left 'J. S.'

Interior of the House of Commons during a debate. Pitt, a tall lank figure, stands at the corner of the table with his back to the spectator, wearing a white powdered wig of formal cut, tied with a large black bag wig. The Speaker (Cornwall) is seen in profile, and Fox, wearing a three-cornered hat, is seated, with a stick, in ill humour, facing the spectator.

12. *Engraving. A coloured Caricature: 'Honest Billy.'* (E. S.)

Published February 18, 1785, by S. W. Fores, Piccadilly.

An upright oval. Pitt standing at the Speaker's table, with his face seen in profile to the right. He wears a black tie and a long tail to his powdered hair. Bills inscribed 'Parliamentary Reform' and 'Commutation Act' are open under his arm.

The heads of other members appear behind in shadow, with written sentences issuing from their mouths. Above is inscribed 'Save, oh, save my country! My father's dying words I never can forget.'

*13. Cameo Medallion by Wedgwood.*

Alto-rilievo within a tall oval. Seen in full to the breast. The youthful face turned in three-quarters to the left. His coat-lappets, thrown open, are peculiarly cut.

[Engraved in woodcut in Miss Meteyard's Life of Josiah Wedgwood, 1866, vol. ii. p. 592.]

1787. AGED 28.

*14. Chalk Drawing attributed to Sir T. Lawrence. (E. S.)*

Youthful face seen in profile to the left. Similar to the oval caricature of 1785, 'Honest Billy.'

Lawrence in this year was only 18 years of age.

[Engraved in 1841 by Lewis.]

1788. AGED 29.

*15. Original Portrait by Gainsborough.*

A half-length figure, the size of life, standing somewhat to the left, holding in his left hand a partly unfolded roll, to which he points with his right hand. The Chancellor's robe lies across an arm-chair to the right, and pens and inkstand and papers are on the table beside him. He wears a coat with doubled-down collar fastened in the front with a single button, buttons on his cuffs, and lace ruffles. His face is seen in three-quarters to the left, his eyes looking at the spectator. But Mrs. Wilson, writing to Lady Chatham in May 1790, says, 'I am a stranger to that vigour of brow, of which Mr. Gainsborough has made so much use.'

[Engraved in the same or the next year by J. K. Sherwin.]

*16. Original Portrait by Gainsborough.*

The property of the Duke of Richmond, at Goodwood.

Somewhat similar to the preceding, but less florid in composition.

*17. Original Portrait by Gainsborough.*

The property of the Earl of Normanton, at Somerley; purchased from Lord Radnor.

The following description of the picture, published by Dr.

Waagen, vol. iv. p. 372, in his account of Lord Normanton's collection at Somerley, shows that this portrait has close affinity to the preceding: 'Portrait of Pitt, still very young, standing, in a brown coat. Next him a table, on which is an inkstand. Behind him a deep crimson curtain. The delicate and shrewd features, of very earnest expression, are of masterly rendering. The left hand is also of great beauty. One of the finest pictures I know by the master, and certainly the most successful portrait of this celebrated statesman.'

18. *Original Portrait by Gainsborough.*

The property of the Hon. Society of Lincoln's Inn.

The same as the last described.

The letter in his hand is inscribed, 'To the Rt. Honble. Wm. Pitt, First Lord of the Treasury, &c. &c. &c.'

This picture was presented to the Society in 1868 by Lady Turner, in accordance with the wish and intention expressed by Lord Justice Sir James Turner.

19. *Original Portrait by Gainsborough.*

In the possession of Earl Stanhope, at Chevening; formerly belonging to Archbishop Manners Sutton, and to Lord Canterbury.

To the waist, the size of life, seen within an oval border.

The position of the figure, and turn of the face, and dress are very similar to those in the last but one portrait.

[Engraved by W. Holl, in 1862.]

20. *Original Portrait by Gainsborough.*

In the Fitzwilliam Collection at Cambridge.

Similar to the preceding, but not showing the coat low down enough to include the fastening by a single button.

21. *Original Portrait by Gainsborough.*

In the possession of Earl Amherst, at Montreal in Kent.

Similar to the preceding, but enclosed in an oval frame of oak-leaves, painted to represent a stone carving.

It is paler and bluer in tone than the last two described.

*22. A small Portrait on canvas, Gainsborough.*

Similar to the Chevening portrait.

1789. AGED 30.

*23. Original Drawing by James Gillray.*

Tinted in water-colours on paper.

Seen to the waist, wearing a pale blue-grey coat with high standing collar, a white cravat, and frilled shirt below. His closely shaven face is seen in three-quarters, and the grey eyes fixed on the spectator. Shafts of columns appear in the background, with sky to the left. Signed in front, 'Js. Gillray.'

Other sketches in pencil are on the back. Bought by H. W. Martin at a sale of Fores's caricatures, 1859.

Presented to the National Portrait Gallery, November 1861, by Mr. H. W. Martin.

*24. Large original Engraving by James Gillray. (E. S.)*

Painted and engraved.

Seen to below the knees, seated in a square-backed chair, towards the right, resting his right arm and hand upon two papers laid on the table, inscribed 'Annual Reduction of the National Debt' and 'Regulation of the Slave Trade.' He wears a white cravat, lace-frilled shirt-front, and a plain coat with tall doubled-down collar and large plain buttons. He wears knee-breeches, and the legs are crossed.

'London, Pubd. Feby. 20th, 1789, by Js. Gillray and S. W. Fores, Piccadilly.'

Below are the family arms, with the motto 'Benigno numine.'

*25. Engraving in mezzotint by John Jones, after Romney. (E. S.)*

Being an amplification of the portrait by Romney in 1783. Size, 1 foot 6 inches by 1 foot 2 inches.

Seen to below the knees, seated in a square-backed chair, nearly facing the spectator, with a plain pilastered wall behind. He wears the embroidered robe of the Chancellor of the Exchequer over a coat fastened with two large round buttons, and a light waistcoat below. He rests the tips of his fingers on a paper laid

open on a carpet-patterned table-cover, inscribed 'Regency Bill.' His left hand grasps a plain roll of paper.

Mrs. Wilson, writing to Lady Chatham on May 30, 1790, speaks of 'an oval portrait of Mr. Pitt, taken from a picture by Romney for Mr. Wilson some years since. He only sketched the head. An engraver has now taken a print from it, and added a body so unlike the original that, on seeing the Goliath-like appearance, I took the hasty resolution to decapitate Mr. Pitt, and now I have pleasure in recognising in this mangled unfinished piece a trace of that vivid glow of good humour and fine turn of countenance, which I ever thought preferable to mere beauty, without which I can form no idea of Mr. Pitt.'

And Lady Chatham answers: 'For the oval print of his Excellency, I confess that I never should have guessed it.'

26. *Engraving in mezzotint by Haid.* (E. S.)

Oval, within a square.

Copy of head and shoulders of the preceding. The face turned the reverse way. No date or name of artist.

'Se vend chés Haid.'

27. *Engraving in stippled outline.* (E. S.)

A feeble copy of the mezzotint by John Jones. Inscribed below: 'Pitt, Statts Minister in England. M. Zell, sculp.'

28. *Caricature Etching by James Sayer.*

In the British Museum.

A long, tall, striding, single figure, seen in profile, advancing to the right. He is dressed in a black suit, with knee-breeches, a black bag to his hair, and projecting shirt-frill. He carries a three-cornered hat under his left arm, and holds in his right hand a roll of paper inscribed 'Regency Restrictions.' It is inscribed below, '17, 1789. No. 3 Piccadilly, M. W. P.,' and to the right 'J. S.'

29. *Original Mezzotint Engraving by H. Kingsbury.* (E. S.)

'Published July 15, 1789, by S. W. Fores, No. 3 Piccadilly.'

30. *Engraving by Bartolozzi, in stipple.* (E. S.)

After J. S. Copley's drawing for the Death of Chatham, made in 1779, when Pitt was 20 years of age. See *ante*.

'Published January 19th, 1789, by W. Dickinson.'

31. *Medalet.*

Signed and dated, 'G. I. 1789.'

A profile bust turned to the right, wearing a plain cravat and shirt-frill.

32. *Medalet.*

Same size as preceding.

A profile bust turned to the right, wearing a plain tie, a laced shirt-frill, and a queue behind. Dated 1789. 'The Right Hon. W. Pitt.' No artist's name.

33. *Engraving by Sherwin, after Gainsborough of 1788.* (E. S.)

1792. AGED 33.

34. *Engraving by Bartolozzi.*

A proof of the Death of Chatham, after Copley's picture in 1780, was exhibited at the Royal Academy this year, No. 459 of the Catalogue. Tuer, vol. i. p. 11.

35. *Original Portrait by Gainsborough Dupont.*

Painted from the life.

Seen to the waist, within an oval, painted border, wearing a coat with tall, doubled-down collar fastened by one large button, a white cravat, and shirt-frill. The hair is grey and loose, and not dressed in curls. The face is seen in three-quarters turned to the left, the eyes looking at the spectator with the side of the nose in shadow, quite similar to the Gainsborough types, especially the Chevening portrait of 1788. It corresponds even to the number of buttons.

The picture belonged to Sir Brook Watson, Bart.

[Engraved on a large scale by R. Earlom in 1806.]

36. *Original Portrait by Gainsborough Dupont.*

In the possession of the Hon. G. M. Fortescue.

37. *Original Etching. A Caricature by James Gillray. (E. S.)*

'The Bottomless Pitt. Published March 16, 1792, by H. Humphrey, No. 18 Old Bond Street.'

A slim, full-length figure seen in profile, standing to the right at the Speaker's table with his right hand raised. The sword is on his right side. He wears knee-breeches, buckles, ruffles, and frill to shirt, with a large black bag and rosette to his hair. A label issues from his mouth. There are no other figures in the composition.

1793. AGED 34.

38. *Large Picture of the Interior of the House of Commons, painted by Carl Anton Hickel.*

Commenced in 1793, and occupied him for two years. Nagler says that he refused a considerable sum for it, and took it with him to Hamburg, where he died in 1798. Afterwards in the Belvédère Gallery at Vienna.

Presented by H.I.M. the Emperor of Austria to Lady Paget for the National Portrait Gallery, and received there July 8, 1885.

The figure of Pitt is attired in a blue coat and knee-breeches, gilt buttons, and white waistcoat. He raises his right arm with a somewhat deprecatory gesture.

39. *Original Portrait, drawn and engraved in stipple by Condé.*

'Printed for J. Parsons, May 30, 1793.' Inscribed above the oval, 'Monthly Beauties.'

A breast portrait seen within an upright oval, border composed of two lines. The figure is turned to the right, wearing a dark coat with large buttons, and high folded-down collar.

1794. AGED 35.

40. *Original Crayon Drawing by S. De Koster.*

In the possession of W. Bellingham, Esq.

41. *Engraving in mezzotint, after the preceding. (E. S.)*

Crayon drawing on a large scale, 1 foot  $5\frac{1}{2}$  inches by 1 foot and  $\frac{3}{4}$  inch, by G. Keating. The figure is seen to the waist, within a square deep-set border.

Published January 1794, by John Brydon, Charing Cross.

Printed in coloured inks, with a reddish tint on the face, and a dark blue on the coat. The Pitt arms below. Dedicated to John, Earl of Chatham, K.G.

42. *Engraving.* (E. S.)

A small stipple portrait, of an 8vo. size to suit a magazine.

Inscribed, 'Published by Chapman & Co., Fleet Street, March 1794.'

43. *A Copper Token, 'Cinque Ports.'* (E. S.)

*On the obverse* a profile bust turned to the right, wearing a coat with large turnover collar, a close cravat, and a gown over shoulder.

Inscribed, 'The R. Hon. W. Pitt, Lord Warden Cinque Ports.'

*On the reverse* a shield of arms, and round it 'Cinque Ports token. Payable at Dover, 1794.'

44. *Engraving, in 'Wraxall's Memoirs,' in line, by W. Greatbatch.*

From a miniature by Ozias Humphry, R.A.

Seen to the waist, the face turned in three-quarters to the right, the eyes looking at the spectator. The date of the portrait is indicated by the large bunched tie of his cravat, which was adopted in France in the early years of the Revolution.

See 'Wraxall's Posthumous Memoirs,' published in 1836, vol. ii. p. 257.

1795. AGED 36.

45. *Small Etching.*

A half-length figure standing to the right. Headed 'Ministerial Eloquence.' 'A. S. inv., published Jany. 6, 1795, by H. Humphrey.' Wearing a coat with high folded-down collar, and neckcloth tied in a bow. His right hand, palm upwards, held forward. Lines below, 'Our great successes, &c.'

46. *Portrait painted by C. A. Hickel, and engraved by F. G. Hoeck.*

(Probable date.)

47. *Large square Mezzotint Engraving,* from the preceding.  
(E. S.)

A half-length figure seated to the right at a table, resting his

right arm on a sheet of the 'Times' newspaper which lies across the table.

'William Pitt. Painted by A. Hickel. Engraved by F. G. Hoeck.'

1796. AGED 37.

48. *Full-length Portrait, in the Court-room of Trinity House,  
painted by Gainsborough Dupont.*

Date of payment recorded on the Court books, June 24, 1796.  
'Paid Mr. Dupont for painting a full-length portrait of Mr. Pitt  
with four others for the new Court-room, 420*l.*'

A full-length figure, the size of life, standing to the left, resting firmly on his left leg. He holds forth a paper inscribed 'A Bill, &c.,' in his right hand, the left rests on his hip. Across a richly-gilt chair, behind him, to the right is laid the embroidered robe of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He wears a blue coat with tall standing scarlet collar and gilt buttons, a white cravat and frill, a long straight waistcoat, and knee-breeches of yellowish white, and small gilt buttons. The face is turned in three-quarters to the left; his black, glistening eyes look piercingly at the spectator. The cuffs of his sleeves are of the same blue as his coat. The scarlet collar alone designates the rank of Master or Elder Brotherhood of the Trinity House.

A richly-painted picture, with powerful shadows.

[Engraved in 1808 by Bromley.]

1797. AGED 38.

49. *Portrait by W. Miller. (E. S.)*

Engraved in mezzotint by J. Murphy.

The figure, seen rather more than half-length, stands facing the spectator, wearing a dark coat fastened by one metal button over a light waistcoat. The face is turned in three-quarters to the left, the eyes looking upwards with a theatrical expression. On a table below to the left lies the Chancellor's gown.

'W. Miller pinxit, J. Murphy sculpsit. The Right Honble., &c. Published May 1797 by G. Testolini, 73 Cornhill.'

50. *Engraved in Mezzotint by John Young, after C. A. Hickel. (E.S.)*

Coloured. Dated March 1.

Hickel's picture was also engraved by P. M. Alix.

1798. AGED 39.

51. *Coloured Caricature* (May 10, 1798). (E. S.)

'He would be a soldier, the sweet Willy O.'

Pitt as a soldier, standing with musket in position of attention, seen in profile to the right. His eye is fixed on the spectator. At the top of the plate is inscribed, 'The Royal Soldier in his Majesty's Service.'

52. *Coloured Caricature* (July 30, 1798.) (E. S.)

'Military Portraits.' An oblong square.

Pitt is seen in scarlet uniform mounted on horseback in profile to the right. His sabre rests on his shoulder. Spectators in the distance.

1799. AGED 40.

53. *Portrait painted by W. Owen.*

Formerly in the possession of Viscount Melville, and now the property of the Duke of Newcastle at Clumber.

[Engraving published in 1806.]

To the waist, within a square, wearing a dark blue coat, red collar (Windsor uniform), and metal buttons, with a cross or anchor upon them. On canvas, the size of life.

54. *Mezzotint Engraving from the above by H. S. Goed (an anagram of Hedges).* (E. S.)

Description same as above.

'William Pitt. Published June 4, 1799, by H. S. Goed, Leicester Square.'

[Another engraving from this picture was done in line on a smaller scale by F. Bartolozzi, &c., published February 1806.]

55. *Crayon Drawing by S. De Koster.*

Exhibited at the London Tavern, August 14, 1799.

The pose of the figure is similar to that of the last-described portrait.

Very superior to De Koster's portrait executed in 1794.

56. *Large square Stipple Engraving, after De Koster.* (E. S.)

'The Right Honble. William Pitt. Published August 1799 by J. Brydon, No. 7 Charing Cross.'

57. *Oval Engraving.* (E. S.)

Small size, foreign.

'Pitt, Grand Ministre d'Angleterre. L. Schleimer fec. 1799.'

Engraved in stipple, and printed in brown.

The hair is cropped, with a pig-tail and black bow. He also wears short whiskers. Entirely unlike any authentic representation of Pitt.

58. *Full-length standing Portrait by Sir Robert Ker Porter.*

A tall standing figure, facing the spectator, in dark coat, knee-breeches, white waistcoat, white cravat and shirt-frill, extending his right hand towards the Chancellor's robe, which lies on a chair to the left. He grasps a roll held down in his left hand, inscribed 'Supplies and Means for 1799.'

The general attitude is theatrical.

59. *Engraving, full-length, of the preceding, in mezzotint.* (E. S.)

'R. K. Porter, Pinxit. S. W. Reynolds, Sculpt.'

60. *Medalet.* (E. S.)

A bust in profile to the left, in a coat with two buttons, shirt-frill in front. The hair full, as in Owen's portrait belonging to this year, with a pigtail in addition.

Inscribed above, 'William Pitt.'

1800. AGED 41.

61. *Bust by L. Gahagan.*

Exhibited at the Royal Academy, No. 1092 of the Catalogue.  
[Gahagan was an assistant to Nollekens.]

1801. AGED 42.

62. *Drawing by H. Edridge.*

Exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1801, No. 359 of the Catalogue.

A full-length figure seated to the left, with a paper on his right knee. He wears a plain coat with metal buttons (one of them appearing within the nick of the collar, as in Owen's portrait of

1799), knee-breeches, and shoes. The face is turned in three-quarters to the left, the eyes looking at the spectator. The robe is laid on the table before him, with boxes, inkstand, and papers.

This portrait corresponds closely with Owen's picture of 1799.

It is at Luffness, the residence of Mr. Hope. It was a present from Mr. Pitt to General Sir A. Hope, conveyed in a letter which is still preserved.

63. *Engraving in stipple, from the above, by Anthony Cardon. (E.S.)*

1803. AGED 44.

64. *Wax Medallion, an alto-rilievo, by S. Percy.*

Exhibited at the Royal Academy, No. 1027 of the Catalogue. Now in the possession of John Lumsden Propert, Esq.

1804.

65. *Engraved Portrait, in upright oval.*

Similar to the portrait by Owen in 1799. Small deviations in the collar of the coat.

'Orme delin. Godley sculp. The Rt. Honorable, &c.'

'Published by Edwd. Orme, His Majesty's Printseller, 1804.'

Face turned in three-quarters to the left; the dark eyes fixed on the spectator. Light admitted from the right-hand side.

1805. AGED 46.

66. *Original Portrait by J. Hoppner (the frontispiece of this book).*

Formerly in the possession of the Marquess of Normandy, K.G., and the last portrait Pitt ever sat for.

Lord Normanby as a boy went with his father to Hoppner's, and saw Pitt then sitting for it.

'This portrait was finished Oct. 28, 1805.'

'It had not been sent home when Pitt died (Clint had been engraving it). Then came applications from the most intimate friends of the deceased statesman for copies. All these, made before the original was sent home, were by express permission of Lord Mulgrave. After that, I know copies of copies were multiplied to any that wished them. My picture went home before the end of 1806, and has never been away since then' (Lord Normanby to Earl Stanhope, May 2, 1862). It was shown at the

British Institution in 1863, No. 154 of the Catalogue, having been brought up in consequence of the publication of Lord Stanhope's Life. It is now the property of W. A. Burdett-Coutts, M.P.

The following Portraits by J. Hoppner correspond exactly with the Mulgrave Picture, and are attributable to this period. They belong to :

67. The Earl of Harrowby, K.G.
68. The Marquess Camden, K.G. [Now at Bayham Abbey.]
69. The Earl of Verulam. [Now at Gorhambury.]
70. Trinity College, Cambridge. [In the Master's Lodge.]
71. Merchant Taylors' Hall, London. [Presented June 1843 to the Court by Newell Connop, Junr., Treasurer to the Pitt Club, which used to hold its triennial dinner in the Company's Hall.]
72. Earl of St. Germans. [At Port Eliot.]
73. National Gallery. [Presented in 1853 by Mr. George Moffatt. Now deposited in the National Portrait Gallery, 1884.]
74. Lord Grenville (uncertain). [At Dropmore.]
75. Mr. Dundas, of Arniston. (Kiteat, 2 feet 5 inches by 2 feet.) [At Arniston.]<sup>1</sup>

*76. A Deviation. Hoppner Portrait.*

The original picture is in the possession of Lord Carrington, and is at Wycombe Abbey, Bucks.

1806. AGED 46 AND 8 MONTHS.

77. *Mezzotint Engraving by George Clint, after the Hoppner Portrait last described.* (E. S.)

'Published Jany. 20th, 1806, by Messrs. Colnaghi & Co.'

DEATH OF PITT. (January 23, 1806.)

78. *An Original Drawing of the Death Mask,*  
*by G. Scharf, C.B., F.S.A.* (E. S.)

From this mask Nollekens executed his numerous busts.

79. *Original Study of the Head alone, by J. Hoppner.*  
In the possession of Sir Walter Stirling, Bart.

<sup>1</sup> The Earl of Malmesbury also has a portrait by Hoppner.

80. *Large Mezzotint Engraving by Earlom, after Gainsborough Dupont.* (E. S.)  
Painted in 1792.

81. *A large full-length Portrait in oil* (posthumous), painted for the Grocers' Company by J. Hoppner.

The price paid for it, with frame, in February 1807, was 204*l.* 10*s.*

82. *Marble Bust of Pitt by Nollekens.*

Williams, in his 'Life of Sir Thomas Lawrence,' vol. i. p. 280, states that Nollekens's busts were solely taken from a post-mortem mask and the portrait by Hoppner lent by Lord Mulgrave.

Smith, in his 'Life of Nollekens,' mentions a bust of Pitt as always on sale by the sculptor, vol. ii. p. 74. He obtained an order from Trinity College, Cambridge, for a statue at the price of 4,000*l.* He sold 74 busts at 120 guineas each, which were executed for him by some inferior artist, and 600 casts at 6*l.* apiece.

83. *An imitation of the preceding,*

A bust in marble, is at Clandon Park.

84. *Small bronze Bust.*

Attributable to this period, in the possession of the Merchant Taylors' Company.

85. *Engraving by Bartolozzi.*

In line, after the portrait by Wm. Owen in 1799.

86. *Silhouette by J. Field.* (E. S.)

After Nollekens's bust. A note on the copy in the British Museum states that it was submitted to Lady Hester Stanhope and touched by her.

87. *Engraved Portrait.* (E. S.)

'Josph. Bye sculpsit. Published Dec. 8th, 1806.'

88. *Engraving in stipple.* (E. S.)

Within an oval. 'Orme delin. Godley sculp. Jany. 25, 1806.'

89. *A small Etching, coloured.* (E. S.)

Published March 1806 by Laurie and Whittle.

90. *A coloured Caricature, 'An Evergreen.'* (E. S.)

'Published April 3rd, 1806, by S. W. Fores.'

91. *Medallion.* (E. S.)

A head in profile to the right in ivory, on a bronze badge inscribed 'Non sibi sed patriæ.' On the reverse 'Pitt Club.'

92. *Medallion.*

Inscribed, 'Gulielmus Pitt,' by 'Halliday.'

93. *Medallion.*

Round the rim, 'He was a man,' &c. Signed 'Ph. Wyon.'

94. *Medallion.*

Signed below near the outer rim, 'T. W. Ingram.'

95. *Medallion.* (E. S.)

Inscribed, 'Gulielmo Pitt, R.P.Q.B.' Signed 'F. Webb.'

96. *Medallion.* (E. S.)

The Pitt Club of the town and county of Leicester.

1807.

97. *Bust by Garrard.*

98. *Bust by P. Turnerelli.*

99. *Profile in Wax, by Miss Andras.*

100. *Engraving of a Cameo Portrait.*

Published by Daniel.

1808.

101. *Original Oil Painting by Sir Thomas Lawrence.*

A posthumous portrait. The size of life.

[This picture is in the possession of the Earl of Rosebery.]

102. *A similar Picture, by Sir Thomas Lawrence,*

Is in the corridor at Windsor Castle.

103. *Marble Bust by Nollekens.*

Presented, March 1861, by Earl Granville to the National Portrait Gallery.

104. *Large Mezzotint Engraving, by John Young, of the bust by Nollekens.* (E. S.)

105. *Bust by G. Garrard.*

106. *Full-length Line Engraving by William Bromley.* (E. S.)

From the full-length picture in the Court-room of Trinity House, painted by Gainsborough Dupont in 1796.

1809.

107. *Full-length Painting by Blake.*

Now in the National Gallery.

108. *Bust by Flaxman.*

109. *Engraving of the Head, from a bust by Flaxman.*

'Published Oct. 1809, by T. Cadell and W. Davies.'

110. *Model of a Bust by Garrard.*

Wearing the robes of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

111. *Model by Garrard.*

For a statue, in a Master of Arts' gown.

112. *Wax profile (?) by P. Roun.*

113. *Profile (?) by T. Warner.*

1810.

114. *Marble Bust by Sir F. Chantrey.*

In Trinity House, Tower Hill, in the Model-room.

Another bust by Chantrey, executed in 1835, is in the Hall of Pembroke College, Cambridge.

115. *Stipple Vignette Engraving by H. Meyer. (E. S.)*

Of the head from Hoppner's portrait painted in 1805.

116. *Medallion. (E. S.)*

'Sheffield Pitt Club, 1810.'

1811.

117. *Gem Engraving by W. Brown.*

118. *Intaglio by N. Marchant.*

1812.

119. *Engraving in stipple, by T. Blood.*

From the bust by Flaxman, for the 'European Magazine.'

1813.

120. *Monument with allegorical figures, in Guildhall, London,  
by J. G. Bubb.*

Proposed in 1806, was completed this year. It cost  
4,078*l.* 17*s.* 3*d.*

The inscription was from the pen of George Canning.

121. *Pitt's Monument in Guildhall, engraved in outline  
by G. Cooke. (E. S.)*

122. *The Monument in Guildhall, a small square engraving by W. Finden.* (E. S.)

123. *Monument by Westmacott.*

At the west end of Westminster Abbey.

It is described in Dean Stanley's 'Westminster Abbey,' p. 288: 'Pitt stands in his robes of Chancellor of the Exchequer, over the west door of the Abbey, trampling on the French Revolution in the attitude so well known by his contemporaries, "drawing up his haughty head, stretching out his arm with commanding gesture, and pouring forth the lofty language of inextinguishable hope."

124. *Medallion.*

'Dudley Pitt Club, 1813.' Signed 'Wm. Wyon.'

125. *Medallion.* (E. S.)

Inscribed, 'Manchester Pitt Club.' Signed 'F. Wyon.'

126. *Medallion.* (E. S.)

'Wolverhampton Pitt Club, 1813.' Signed 'F. Wyon.'

1814.

127. *Medallion.*

'Warrington Pitt Club.'

128. *Medallion.* (E. S.)

Birmingham Pitt Club, 1814.

129. *Medalet.* (E. S.)

Nottingham Pitt Club, 1814.

130. *Large Medallion.*

131. *Large Bronze Medallion.* (E. S.)

Similar profile to the preceding. Inscribed, 'T. Wyon, Jun.'

132. *Medalet.* (E. S.)

'Stirling Pitt Club, 1814.'

1815.

133. *Full-length Marble Statue by Nollekens.*

In the Senate House, Cambridge.

134. *Full-length Engraving by J. Heath, from the preceding Statue.*

135. *Small Engraving in the stipple manner,  
by W. T. Fry.* (E. S.)

'From an original drawing by T. Gainsborough.'

136. *Portrait by Shepperson.*

137. *Engraving by Walker, in line, after the preceding.* (E. S.)

138. *Large Engraving in stipple, by Gaugain.* (E. S.)

Published by Edward Orme.

The size of life, after the portrait by Gainsborough at Chevening.

139. *Engraving by E. Bell on large folio plate, from the bust by Gahagan.*

1818.

140. *Original Portrait by G. Harlowe.*

(Posthumous.) In the Hall of Pembroke College, Cambridge.

141. *Model for a statue 'to be cast in bronze.'*

Exhibited by R. Westmacott at the Royal Academy.

142. *Engraving of a statue by Cook, after a drawing by Bromley.*  
(E. S.)

1820.

143. *Line Engraving of 'The Death of Chatham,' by Delatre.*  
 (E. S.)

A small copy from Bartolozzi's large line engraving.  
 'Published March 1st, 1820, by Wm. J. White, Brownlow St.'

144. *Medallion.*

Blackburn Hundred Pitt Club, 1820.

145. *Engraving after Bartolozzi's 'Death of Chatham,' in line, by Delatre.*

1821.

146. *Silver Medallion.* (E. S.)

Suffolk Pitt Club.

147. *Medalet.*

Suffolk Pitt Club.

1822.

148. *Small square line Engraving by Thomas Bragg, after the Hoppner portrait of 1805.* (E. S.)

1823.

149. *Portrait of Mr. W. Pitt.*

Exhibited at the Royal Academy by J. Kennedy.

150. *Small Head, after Clint.*

Engraved in line by John Henry Robinson.

1831.

151. *Colossal Bronze Statue by Sir F. Chantrey.*

Erected in Hanover Square. The statue cost £7,000.

[Cunningham, in his 'Handbook to London,' 1850, p. 221, gives an account of an attempt made to pull down and destroy the statue whilst Chantrey's workmen employed in placing it on

its pedestal were absent at their breakfast. The statue belongs to the proprietor of Hanover Square, and does not appear in a Parliamentary return of public statues in London moved for by Mr. Hankey, June 30, 1862.]

1833.

152. *Colossal Bronze Statue by Chantrey.*

Similar to the preceding.

Erected at Edinburgh, and inscribed on the base, 'F. Chantrey, Sculptor and Founder, 1833.'

153. *Mezzotint Engraving by S. Cousins, of the preceding bronze statue, 'William Pitt.'* (E. S.)

From a statue in bronze erected in Edinburgh by the Pitt Club of Scotland twenty-three years after his death.

1834.

154. *Small figure in biscuit, probably by Cocker of Derby.*

1835.

155. *Marble Bust by Chantrey.*

Presented by Lord Farnborough to the University of Cambridge, and placed in the Hall of Pembroke College.

1836.

156. *Mezzotint Engraving by S. W. Reynolds.* (E. S.)

From the posthumous portrait by Lawrence, now at Windsor.

157. *Engraving, after a portrait by Ozias Humphry.*

Published in Wraxall's 'Posthumous Memoirs,' vol. ii. p. 257.

1837.

158. *Mezzotint Engraving by C. Turner.* (E. S.)

1841.

159. *Engraving by Lewis, after Sir T. Lawrence's sketch in 1787.* (E. S.)

1861.

160. *Engraving by Wm. Holl, in stipple.* (E. S.)

From the original drawing by Copley, in the possession of Earl Stanhope, at Chevening. Frontispiece to the 'Life of William Pitt,' by Earl Stanhope.

1862.

161. *Engraving in mixed style, by William Holl.* (E. S.)

From the original picture by Gainsborough, in the possession of Earl Stanhope, at Chevening.

Frontispiece to vol. iii. of the 'Life of William Pitt.' The original picture belongs to the year 1788.

NOTE.—In addition to the foregoing there are four other portraits mentioned in the *Catalogue of British Mezzotinto Portraits*, by J. Chaloner Smith, pp. 781, 963, 1760 and 1763; and then there may, of course, be a few others that had not come under the notice of Mr. Scharf at date of catalogue; but, having regard to his wide knowledge and great powers of research, it is most improbable that there can be many omissions.

# INDEX

---

ABBOTT (Colchester), 268  
Abercromby, Sir R., 264  
Addington, Rt. Hon. H. S., 246,  
  312, 315, 317, 323, 325  
Ailesbury, Lord, 6  
Amherst, Sir G., 25  
Appleby, 35  
Argyll, Duke of, 41, 51  
Auckland, Lord, 67, 71, 196, 197,  
  234, 242, 248, 265, Preface

BARRINGTON, Sir J., 62–65, 221  
Ball, Rt. Hon. John T., 50, 299  
Beresford, Rt. Hon. John, 67, 69,  
  70, 71, 131, 132, 135, 139, 198,  
  216, 217, 225, 237, 265  
Bolton, Lord. *See* Orde  
Bond, Oliver, 268  
Brougham, Lord, 40, 326  
Buckingham, Lord, 217  
Buckinghamshire, Lady, 246  
Burdett-Coutts, W. A., Preface  
Burgh, Hussey, 53  
Burke, Edmund, 35, 38, 89, 148,  
  181, 214, 215, 236

CAMDEN, Lord, 92, 264  
Campbell, Lord, 200, 304, 325, 326  
Canning, G., 24, 41, 317, 318, 359  
Carlisle, Lord, 67, 191, 207, 208, 210  
Castlereagh, Lord, 271, 294, 303,  
  306, 361, 363  
Cavendish, Lord G., 218  
Chatham, Lady, mother of Pitt,  
  2, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19,

  20, 24, 28, 30, 31, 35, 150, 156,  
  160, 161, 164, 166, 170  
Chatham, Lord, father of Pitt, 4, 5,  
  6, 7, 8, 20, 31  
Chatham, second Earl, 169, 172,  
  173, 175, 177, 179, 309  
Clare, Lord (*see* Fitzgibbon), ch. viii.  
  *passim*, 64, 294, 295  
Clare, Lady, 277  
Cleveland, Duchess of, Preface, 324,  
  358  
Clonmel, Lord, 65, 66, 136  
Cooke, E., 119  
Coombe Wood, 6 *note*  
Cornwallis, Lord, 291, 306  
Corry, Lord, 288  
Crewe, Mrs., 38, 236  
Curran, Rt. Hon. J. P., 65, 144, 250,  
  262, 268

DAVIS, Thomas, 53  
Derby, Lord, 40  
De Staël. *See* Necker  
Devonshire, Duke of, 7  
Devonshire, Georgina, Duchess of,  
  312  
Duffy, Sir G. C., 55  
Dumaresque, 6  
Duncan, Admiral, 265  
Dundas, H., 39, 183, 322

EDEN. *See* Auckland, Lord  
Eden, Hon. Eleanor, 284, 241, 246  
Eldon, Lord, 172, 325, 326, 328, 361  
Elliott, Lady Harriot, 32  
Elliott, Pitt's brother-in-law, 156

FARQUHAR, Sir W., 355  
 Fitzgerald, Lord Edward, 227, 265  
 Fitzgibbon (*see* Clare), ch. viii. 69,  
     294, 295  
 Fitzwilliam, Lord (ch. vi. *passim*)  
 Flood, Rt. Hon. W., 98, 144, 146  
 Foster, Speaker, 186, 294, 299  
 Fox, C. J., 35, 37, 38, 39, 84, 127,  
     148, 313, 328, 329, 361, 362, 367  
 Froude, 54, 65

GEORGE III., 38, 207, 223, 307, 308,  
     318, 321, 329, 331, 351, 352, 354,  
     367  
 Gibbon, E., 41  
 Giffard, Life, 33  
 Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., 180,  
     181, 362  
 Goostree Club, 24  
 Grattan, Rt. Hon. Henry, 65, 143,  
     144, 182, 194, 199, 207, 214, 293,  
     305  
 Grenville, James, 6  
 Grenville, Lord, 184, 186, 329, 330

HARDWICKE, Lord, 271  
 Hely-Hutchinson, 48, 50, 52  
 Hobart, Lord, 245  
 Hoche, General, 227  
 Hope, A., 324  
 Howth, Lord, 52  
 Hutchinson. *See* Hely-Hutchinson

INGRAM, T. D., 94, ch. ix.  
 Irish Parliament, 45

JEFFREY, 267  
 Joyce, P. W., LL.D., 68

KENDALL, 76  
 King, The. *See* George III.  
 Kirwan, Rev. Dr., 221

LAURENTIUS, 6  
 Lecky, Right Hon. W. E. H.,  
     Preface, 65, 68, 181, 258, 265, 280,  
     284, 285  
 Lewis, Sir G. C., 313, 326

Lifford, Lord, 255  
 Lincoln, Bishop of. *See* Tomline  
 Liverpool, Lord, 33  
 Loughborough, Lord, 200, 212, 215,  
     303, 304

MACNALLY, 227  
 MacNevin, 226  
 Mansfield, Lord, 92, 98  
 Milman, Dean, 317, 326  
 Milton, Lord, 191, 198  
 Molyneux, 51  
 Montgomery, Sir G., 218  
 Morley, Rt. Hon. John, 148  
 Mornington, Lord. *See* Lord Wellesley  
 Mountjoy, Lord, 63

NECKER, Mdlle., 232, 238  
 Norbury, Lord, 65  
 North, Lord, 35, 37, 38, 39, 46

O'BEIRNE, Rev. Dr., 190, 192, 205,  
     221  
 O'Leary, Father, 84  
 Oliphant, Mrs., 56  
 Orde, Rt. Hon. Thomas, 48, 44, 45,  
     69, 77, 79, 83, 85, 91, 92, 96, 97,  
     100, 102, 103, 107, 108, 111, 115,  
     124, 184, 188, 145  
 Orde-Powlett. *See* Orde  
 Ormonde, Duke of, 47

PARNELL, Sir John, 198, 290  
 Pelham, Lord, 264, 270, 277, 278, 313  
 Pembroke Hall, 7, 30  
 Pitt, W., *passim*  
 Plunket, Lord, 226, 294  
 Ponsonby family, 190, 191, 195  
 Ponsonby, George, 191, 192, 198,  
     ch. vi. *passim*  
 Portland, Duke of, 181, 182, 185, 208  
 Pretyman (*see* Tomline), 7, 8, 26,  
     31, 238, 306, 311, 312, 315, 316,  
     318, 323, ch. xi.  
 Pretyman, Ernest G., M.P., Preface  
 Pretyman, Mrs., 345, 348

REILLY, Sheriff, 252

Reynolds, Sir Joshua, 74, 75  
 Rose, Rt. Hon. G., 109, 136, 141,  
     305, 306, 317, 356, 359  
 Rosebery, Lord, 44, 181, 182, 223, 326  
 Russell, Lord John, 36  
 Rutland, Duchess of, 43  
 Rutland, Duke of, 31, 37, 39, 42, 58,  
     62, 69, 72, 73, 74, 78, 99, 101, 111,  
     115, 116, 120, 121, 145, 146, 252,  
     255, 305  
 Rutland, present Duke of, Preface

SEARLE, Rev. Dr., Pembroke Hall, 7  
 Selwyn, George, 35, 37  
 Sheares, Brothers, 229, 265  
 Shelburne, Lord, 36, 37, 43, 44, 53  
 Sheridan, C. F., 269  
 Sheridan, R. B., 38, 134, 181, 362  
 Spenser, Lord, 181, 182, 185  
 Stanhope, Lady Hester, 244, 245,  
     323, 358  
 Stanhope, Lord, historian, 2, 6, 8,  
     40, 150, 172, 238  
 Stanhope, present Lord, Preface, 2  
 Stanhope, Hon. Mrs. Edward, Preface  
 Stanhope, Rt. Hon. Edward, Preface  
 Swift, Dean, 52  
 Sydney, Lord, 119, 122, 123

TANDY, Napper, 251  
 Temple, Lord, 38, 39, 42  
 Thurlow, Lord, 39  
 Tierney, G., 167  
 Tomline, Bishop (*see* Pretyman), 7,  
     8, 26, 31, 238, 306, 311, 312, 315,  
     316, 318, ch. xi.  
 Tone, Wolfe, 225, 226  
 Turner, Rev. Dr., 7, 8  
 Tyrone, Lord, 68

WALSH, Right Hon. J. E., 59  
 Waterford, late Marquis of, Preface  
 Wellesley, Arthur (Wellington), 114,  
     256  
 Wellesley, Lord, 5, 114  
 Westminster Abbey, 31, 364  
 Westmorland, Lord, 281, 305  
 Wilson, Rev. E., 2, 3, 4, 7, 10, 151,  
     159  
 Wilberforce, 24, 33, 40, 231, 234,  
     359  
 William III., 48  
 Windham, 24, 40, 181, 279, 361  
 Wolfe, Lord Kilwarden, 220  
 Wraxall, Sir N., 33, 172

YORK, Duke of, 279











TWO VOLUMES, CROWN 8VO, CLOTH.

PRICE 15S.

---

# CHRISTIAN ROME.

*A HISTORICAL VIEW OF  
ITS MEMORIES AND MONUMENTS, 41—1867.*

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH OF  
E. DE LA GOURNERIE, K.S.G.,

BY  
THE HON. LADY MACDONALD.

WITH A PREFACE BY  
*HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL VAUGHAN.*

---

## Opinions of the Press.

**TABLET.**—“In the two attractively bound volumes before us Lady Macdonald has given to the English-speaking public a simple and connected account of the growth of “Christian Rome” under the fostering hand of the Sovereign Pontiffs. We are glad to be able to accord a welcome to the work, and to recommend its perusal by the general reader, whether Protestant or Catholic. For, as Cardinal Vaughan in his Preface to the book writes: ‘The spirit of the work is admirable, and the narrative of the innumerable scenes and thrilling events of which these volumes are made up is pleasant, and even exciting.’ ”

**SPECTATOR.**—“The plan of the book is good. Beginning with the year 41 of the first century, when St. Peter is supposed to have become Bishop of Rome, it takes the centuries one by one down to our own day, gives a few details on each of the Popes, and a clear historical sketch of public events at Rome during their reigns, as well as a description, frequently detailed and vivid, of the churches built or restored, and the great works of art carried through. It would be difficult to find a more complete chronicle of nineteen centuries in two volumes.”

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY  
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

---

DA 522. P6481

U.S. SOUTHERN MEXICAN LIBRARY FACULTY

A 000 952 170 8

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE  
THIS BOOK CARD



University Research Library

DA 522. P6481

CALL NUMBER

AUTHOR

DATE

SET

VOL

P1

COP

ASHBOURNE / PITT SOME

